THE

BC

AMERICAN

CATHOLIC QUARTERLY

REVIEW.

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas vincat volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum veritas vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantem sive confitentem.

S. AUG. EPIST. CCXXXVIII. AD PASCENT.

VOLUME XVI.

FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1891.

PHILADELPHIA:

HARDY & MAHONY,

PUBLISHERS AND PROPRIETORS,

505 CHESTNUT STREET.

COPYRIGHT, 1891,

BY

HARDY & MAHONY.

70749

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. XVI.—JULY, 1891.—No. 63.

THE IDEA OF A PAROCHIAL SCHOOL.

THE Catholic Church in the United States, finding herself unable to accept as satisfactory the prevailing system of State education, has adopted the policy of instituting and supporting a distinct educational system of her own. It is not the purpose of the writer of this paper to set forth the reasons that have led her to do so. These reasons are obvious to Catholics; they have been expounded time and again with irrefutable logic to the non-Catholic world. If sound reasoning were candidly made arbiter instead of unreasoning prejudice, the vast body of outsiders would come to recognize that it is not mere sentiment nor unreasoning bigotry which induces millions of their fellow-citizens to pay twice over for the education of their children. But, for the time being, prejudice prevents them from giving a calm and impartial thought to the subject; the position of the Church is ignored or misrepresented, and it will probably take some time before the American sense of justice will be aroused to assert itself in this matter and find an equitable solution of the educational problem. Meanwhile, we believe it is our duty and best interest to look to our own system and to inquire whether some improvements may be desirable in them and feasible in practice.

A complete educational system may be compared to one of those noble edifices which Christian faith has erected all over the world to the honor and glory of God. The foundations and basement represent elementary education, the floor and walls of the main building represent secondary, high school, or college education, and the groined stone ceiling, the massive roof, the towers, min-

arets, statues, bas-reliefs, and other ornaments represent the liberal culture of university education. In the case of material edifices, it is often found expedient to content oneself for a time with building the basement only, and leave to another generation, or, perhaps, postpone indefinitely, the completion of the superstructure. So, too, with our educational edifice. The vast majority of American Catholics must, for the present at least, content themselves with the substructure of primary education. It is to be hoped that, with advancing years, ever-increasing numbers will be in a position to secure for themselves the benefits of higher education. The establishment of the Catholic University sets before our people a high ideal which all may admire and reverence, and to which many will, we trust, aspire. The founding of the free Catholic High School of Philadelphia is a most important step in the direction of introducing all classes of our people to the portals, at least, of higher education. This Catholic Institute will, we hope, find a counterpart at no distant date in every large city throughout the land. But, for the present, our chief concern is for our primary, or, as it is commonly called, parochial school system.

The education given in our parochial schools should be solid enough to form a worthy foundation for higher education, and broad, and deep, and complete enough to satisfy the needs of those who are supposed to find in it their full equipment for the practical work of life. Thus, a pupil of ordinary talent who has gone through the parochial school curriculum, ought to be able to take up easily the course of higher studies pursued in a seminary or college. And, on the other hand, if, as happens in most cases, he has not the opportunity of pursuing his studies further, what he has learned in the parochial school ought to enable him to fill any ordinary position in life with credit, and advantage to himself and to society. Further, he ought to have acquired in the parochial school the ambition to improve himself, if ever he gets the opportunity, and, in consequence, the ambition to procure for his children the higher education which he himself was unable to obtain.

This cannot be considered a too high ideal, especially in America. The public schools aim at it, and fairly attain it if we are to judge by the intelligence of the average American citizen who has received none but a common school education. The Fathers of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, in their decrees concerning the education of youth, reiterated with marked approval the recommendation of the Congregation of the Holy Office, sent through the Propaganda on November 24, 1875, that the Catholic schools should, in teaching methods and results (*institutione ac disciplina*), come up to the standard of the public

schools. This recommendation is founded on justice and self-respect, as, indeed, the Fathers themselves elsewhere (*loc. cit.*, No. 200) intimate. Justice towards parents and children alike demands that the generosity and loyalty (*generosa devotio*) with which they support Catholic schools should be recompensed by an adequate supply of secular education. And the same reasons which have made the Church the mother of learning in all ages, demand that her schools, while excelling in the inculcation of Christian doctrine and morality, shall be second to none in useful acquirements and liberal culture.

Far be it from us to offer any general opinion one way or the other about the relative worth of the public and parochial schools. Our personal experience is that in some cases the parochial school is superior, in others inferior to its rival neighbor. But, be this as it may, it is certain that our parochial school system as a whole is laboring under disadvantages of method which incapacitate it from performing as fully and satisfactorily as it otherwise might, the high functions confided to it by the Church, by the confidence of Catholic parents, and, tacitly, at least, by the State.

If we specify "disadvantages of method" only, it must not be understood that we leave out of sight those *material* disadvantages of the slight pecuniary resources on which our parochial school system has to rely, as compared with the lavish supply of funds at the command of the public schools. We may be permitted to dismiss this part of the subject with just two remarks:

First. It may be safely assumed that the generosity of American Catholics, which holds a unique place in the annals of Christianity, will be spurred on to greater and entirely satisfactory efforts, once it is brought to recognize the importance of the matter, and once it finds itself in presence of the fact that the parochial schools are bound to be not only equal but superior to the public schools.

Secondly. We would remark that it has yet to be discovered, in the history of education, that ampleness of funds always implies excellence of teaching, that the most richly endowed institutions turn out the best scholars, that fat salaries can always secure the the devotedness, tact, and the enthusiasm of the true teacher.

Again, when we draw attention to some of the "disadvantages of method" of our parochial schools, we disclaim any intention of implying that the "methods" by which the public schools are governed and regulated are perfect. Far from it. There is no country in the world where so much of the state's money is spent on education, and with such meagre results as in America. This is due in a great measure to the pernicious influence of politics and politicians, on the public school system. It is the ward politicians who select or dismiss at their pleasure, the teachers of

their ward schools, and that often, if not in all cases, for reasons that are but slightly connected with the interests of education. It is the same sapient body that has a controlling voice in choosing text-books, and in adopting new methods of teaching. It has been charged, with what truth we know not, that the change in text-books is often brought about by the corrupt canvassing of some enterprising bookseller; and the continuous changes that are being made in the methods of teaching are distinctly traceable to the anomalous position of the school directors. Incapable as a rule, of judging for themselves in educational matters, they are at the mercy of the plausible experimentalist. They run no pecuniary risk in experimenting, so flexibly vast are the resources at their command; and, thus, the very immensity of the State educational endowments is a source of weakness, inasmuch as it encourages irresponsible and unqualified persons to be ever ready to adopt crude views and theories which may have no merit but their newness.

Another great defect in the public school system, and one on which all educators are agreed, is the preponderating number and influence of lady teachers. It is pitiable to see whole generations of boys wronged by the claims set up by women's right to teach them, all through their school course. A lady may, undoubtedly, be the very best teacher for a boy up to a certain age, say that of twelve at the outside, but after that her mission for good ceases. For, as long as the distinction between the sexes ordained by the Author of nature lasts, a woman will not be the fit instrument to train a boy to manliness, no more than a man is, to train a girl to womanliness—except, perhaps, in the rare case of a particularly *masculine* woman or *effeminate* man. We have, of course to acknowledge that our parochial school system is subject to this same disadvantage of having an undue proportion of lady teachers. But, our lady teachers, being nearly all members of Religious sisterhoods, bring to the work of teaching, qualities which cannot be expected from the average secular lady teacher. Our Sisters take up the mission of educators, not for a few years only, but for a life-time. They concentrate on their work their own personal experience, gathered in the course of years, as well as the experience of the whole religious community to which they belong. Their very character is religious, their ascetic mode of life, their demure costume which reflects to the eyes of the Catholic children the beauty that is within—all these give our Sisters an authority and influence over boys of even advanced years which the men *lay* teachers could scarcely ever expect to acquire. Our Sisters stand toward all Catholic children *in loco parentis*, somewhat in the same manner as the Mother

of Jesus, their prototype, stood to the Apostles after the Ascension.

Still, while claiming all these advantages for our Sisters, we are none the less persuaded that, even in their case, it would be far preferable that they should cease to teach boys after a certain age.

We could easily go on enumerating defects in the public school system, but what we have said is sufficient to show that we are far from regarding it as perfect. Nay, we feel convinced that notwithstanding the immense pecuniary disadvantages under which our parochial schools lie, it would yet be possible to raise them to even a higher level than that attained by the public schools. We have teachers whose devotedness is equal to any sacrifice which improved methods may entail; we have a youth, fresh with the freshness of innocence and virtue, and in consequence brimful of talent; we have a Catholic people whose past sacrifices in the cause of religion are a guarantee that they will be ready to strain every nerve to second whatever laudable efforts are made to raise up from the dust their children.

We believe that the best *means* for directing all these resources to the great purpose of perpetuating our parochial school system are to be found in the decrees of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, to which we have previously referred entitled "De viis ac mediis Scholas Parochiales quam maxime Promovendi." In previous decrees the Fathers had asserted the necessity of having a Catholic school attached to every parish, and they have burdened the consciences of pastor and people with the obligation of putting their views into effect. Then follow the decrees which we have at present under consideration about raising the standard of parochial schools. These decrees fairly cover the whole field of school organization and are worthy of our most attentive consideration.

First, as regards priests, it is ordained that a good part of their seminary training should be specially directed toward their future pastoral charge of a parochial school. They are to be imbued with the importance of Christian education. Then their studies in psychology, pedagogy and pastoral theology are to be directed with a special view towards the education of youth. Further they are to be trained in the methods of teaching so that they may be able to expound clearly and with effect, catechism and sacred history, the teaching of which is later on committed specially to their care. Priests in pastoral charge are enjoined to love their schools as the apple of their eye, to visit and inspect every part of them frequently—at least once a week,—to watch over the morals of the pupils, to stimulate their studiousness by suitable means,

to teach catechism and sacred history themselves or else to see that these subjects are efficiently taught by members of some religious congregation. They are to keep a close eye on the other studies pursued in the school, and bring them under the notice and favor of the people by means of public examinations to be held once or twice a year; they are to exert themselves to have books compiled by Catholic writers used in the schools; and, finally, they are recommended to do all this with pure motives, and to bear in mind, moreover, that neglect of their duty toward the schools will be a bar to all further promotion.

The decrees deal, in the next place, with the laity. These are to be impressed with the truth that the parochial school is an integral part of the parish; that its existence is not a matter of choice for the pastor, but a burden imposed upon him by the Church which he cannot carry without the help of the laity; that concern for its interests belongs not only to those of the parish who actually use it for the education of their children, but to all, and that it should have a place in the affectionate interest of all, second only to that of the Church itself, as being a conservatory of faith and morals, and a nursery of a rising generation which may prove to be a source of joy and consolation to every one. The laity are enjoined to contribute according to their means to the support of the parochial schools to such an extent that their exterior appearance and internal furnishing and appointments may be suitable; that the number of teachers may be increased in order that thereby the classes may be more numerous and the pupils be better classified. The laity are reminded that effective help of this kind on their part will insure the raising of our school standard, and, by way of encouragement, it is ordained that the laity shall have certain rights and privileges in regard to the management of the schools—these rights and privileges to be defined in detail in the statutes of each diocese, safeguarding, however, the ecclesiastical rights about admitting or dismissing teachers, as well as about discipline and studies.

The third portion of the decrees refers to teachers and the measures to be taken to secure their efficiency. The general principle is laid down that as the status of the school will chiefly depend on the fitness of the teachers, only such as are efficient ought to be put in charge of classes. Accordingly, it is decreed that henceforth none should be admitted to teach in a parochial school, except such as have been previously examined and shown themselves fit and capable. For the purpose of carrying into practical effect this examination of teachers, the several bishops are to appoint, within a year after the holding of the Council, one or more priests versed in educational matters, who are to form a

"Diocesan Commission of Examination of Teachers." This commission is charged in the most solemn manner with the duty of examining teachers. Detailed rules are laid down for its guidance. And no pastor is to engage as teacher any one who is not provided with a certificate from the Commission, excepting such as may have been already employed as teachers before the assembling of the Council. These regulations apply to all teachers whether lay or religious—the latter term to be taken as applying to members of diocesan congregations only. In a subsequent paragraph, special exemptive legislation is made for such Religious Congregations as are not diocesan, and for such as may have more particular agreements with the bishops. This paragraph has an inner history of its own which leads us to believe that it will be altogether eliminated from the decrees of the next Plenary Council.

It is decreed that in every diocese several "School Commissions" shall be constituted for the purpose of examining the schools, both in town and country. It is the duty of each Commission to visit and examine once or twice a year every school within its district, and to make an accurate report thereon to the President of the Central Diocesan Commission who is to submit the same to the Bishop.

To insure a sufficient supply of suitable teachers, the bishops are strongly urged to see that those Religious Congregations which are devoted to teaching should establish when necessary, normal schools wherein adequate training in pedagogy and kindred subjects may be given to the younger members.

The above decrees form the great charter of our parochial school system. They cover nearly the whole field of primary education; and all educationists will agree that, whilst they are sufficiently definite and categorical to secure efficiency, they are at the same time broad and comprehensive, and elastic enough to welcome any suggestions that may be made, with a view of attaining higher excellence. It will be seen by them that the Church appoints over each school a *Manager* whom as her immediate representative she makes responsible for its general working. The local pastor fills this office *ex officio*. The decrees mark out for him a line of duties sufficient to tax his zeal and energy, but they do not overburden him. He is supposed to have acquired in his Seminary course a general knowledge of the best methods of school management as well as of teaching, which will aid him to watch over the school with effect. He is made personally responsible for the Christian doctrine taught in the school, as well as for its morals and discipline; but he has only a general responsibility for the secular studies. This latter is a very wise provision in the

interests of the pastor, as well as of education. It would be too much to expect of any ordinary pastor the detailed, exact and fresh knowledge which should be possessed by the examiner of a school. Even though he may have been a very brilliant scholar in the days when he sat on the school bench, yet his course of studies has been since far removed from that of the parochial school; and his knowledge of elementary subjects, though solid, is only general; and if he has a taste for some particular subject, he may do great harm, by directing undue attention to it; for, of course, pupils and teachers to the detriment of general education will take special pains to be well made up in the favorite subject, proficiency in which will bring upon them encomiums from their pastor. A little experience we had recently, will illustrate this last point. A short time ago, we had occasion to visit an elementary school. The principal, who was a man pretty well advanced in years, showed us the several classes, and tried, naturally to impress us with the proficiency of the pupils. We noticed that, in carrying out his purpose, he confined his questioning almost exclusively to one subject—arithmetic; and to one particular portion of that subject,—percentage. The answering was, undoubtedly, very brilliant. We could not, however, help feeling that here was a principal who had a hobby about percentage; and teachers and pupils aware of its existence, prepared themselves to meet it to the probable neglect of other subjects. An examiner of an elementary, or, for that matter, any school, should be perfectly at home in the subjects taught, and in the very questions to be put. He should be so familiar with the practical teaching work as to know what may be expected from the average pupil, and what may not. Now who will pretend that the average pastor has an opportunity of equipping himself for the rôle of an efficient school examiner. Yet, detailed, close, thorough examination of each school, once or twice a year as provided for by the Council, is a matter of vital importance. It is a part of the parochial school system that cannot be left in abeyance.

The Church, in urging Catholic parents so strongly to patronize and support the parochial schools, enters into a quasi-contract that she will insure the efficiency of the secular teaching given in them. And it is not only in the eyes of Catholics, but also in the eyes of the State and of the world at large, that she assumes this responsibility. Now, she cannot make herself responsible for that of which she has no knowledge; and she can have no reliable knowledge of the educational standard of a given school except by means of examination and inspection. Hence, the Church cannot forego her right and duty in this matter. It may be urged by some that, once a suitable programme of studies is laid down, and

the school confided to reliable teachers, there need be no further anxiety about its working. To this it may be replied that no State would make itself responsible for such a system; and what the State in its worldly wisdom would not do, the Church too is bound not to do. External, independent examination and inspection of a school, serves both as an incentive and means of control. It serves as an incentive, inasmuch as the foreknowledge that their work will be submitted to a serious test, spurs on teachers and pupils to greater efforts. It serves, moreover, as a means of control over the teaching done in the school, and strengthens very much the hands of those who are responsible for its management. For, a well-ordered system of examination will at once detect defective teaching, and (in presence of public proof of inefficiency), it is far easier to have the incapable teacher removed than if such removal were demanded by the personal observations of the pastor only.

We cannot dismiss this part of the subject without referring to the difficulty of finding a sufficient number of suitable examiners, in a given diocese or locality. But few dioceses can afford to set apart even one priest for school examination work; and but few priests feel themselves called to devote their time to the routine and drudgery of such work. We believe that this and many other difficulties which lie in the way of our parochial school system could be obviated by inviting the more active and immediate co-operation of the laity. We believe that it would be found advantageous to give the laity a voice in the management and also in the examination of the schools. It is the laity that support the schools; it is for their interest that the schools have been established; it is they who reap the advantages or disadvantages arising from the success or failure of the Catholic school system. It follows from this that the laity ought to have a voice in its management. The Council has made provision for the representation of the laity of the parish in the management of the parish school. We think it would not be going beyond the spirit of the decree to give them a representation also in the several school Commissions of each diocese. The active presence of suitable laymen on the school Commissions would be a source of strength and usefulness. It would give their fellow-laymen increased confidence in the schools, and an increased willingness to support them.

It may be objected to this proposal that it would be too much to expect that members of Religious Communities who teach in the parochial schools, would submit to have their work inspected by the laity. We believe that this objection is, or certainly ought to be, groundless. For in other countries, notably in England, such teachers are year by year called upon to subject their work to the

close inspection of lay gentlemen who, in most cases, do not even belong to the Church. Teachers worthy the name will not shrink from having their work inspected by anybody, and especially by those most concerned—their patrons and supporters among the laity.

If our parochial schools were thus subjected to systematic and serious inspection and examination on lines laid down in a set and uniform programme of studies and system of instruction, we would have one great guarantee of their efficiency. Each school would be known by its fruits. Its educational results would be set down in black and white for the information of all interested. The report thereon made by competent and disinterested examiners would set forth its merits or defects. No school could afford to continue inefficient under the searching light of public opinion and enlightened criticism. The backward school would be spurred on to attain at least a respectable standard, and the advanced school would be encouraged to aim at the highest excellence. School would naturally be compared with school; wholesome emulation would be excited among teachers and pupils. Prizes could be offered for competition between the several schools of a diocese. Such prizes need not be of much material value, not costlier than the olive wreath which elicited such rivalry and emulation at the Pan-Hellenic festivals of old. The honor of being foremost, the disgrace of being hindmost in the educational race, would be sufficient incentive for every school to put forth its best efforts to obtain an honorable place among its competitors.

The guarantee of efficiency thus obtained with reference to the teaching in our parochial schools is not quite sufficient. Proper inspection and examination, as outlined above, give, it is true, a fairly good insight into and control over the working of a school. But a wise educational system will require that the teachers give adequate proof of their aptitude for educational work before they are permitted to exercise the art of education. The Plenary Council of Baltimore, in the decrees already cited, makes ample provisions for this important educational requirement. It insists on the principle that all teachers should, before being permitted to teach, present satisfactory certificates of competency. Here, again, the Church but provides an educational safeguard which worldly wisdom inspires every State to adopt. See how England, France, and Germany require absolutely that every teacher, whether in a State or a private school, shall have a proper certificate. See how the members of Religious Orders in those countries, so far from shirking this requirement, face it boldly and successfully, only too content to be thus afforded the opportunity of educating God's children for the glory, for the honor of the Church, and for the

lasting benefit of the people. The necessity of requiring that those who profess to educate shall give previous proofs of their fitness is clear on the surface. One of the keenest thinkers of antiquity —the celebrated Horace—complained that in his time every tyro in literature dabbled in poetry.

> *Navim agere ignarus navis timet, abrotonum aegro*
> *Non audet, nisi qui didicit, dare quod medicorum est,*
> *Promittunt medici; Tractant fabrilia fabri.*
> *Scribimus indocti doctique poemata passim.*
> —*Epistolarum*, ii., 1, ll., 114–117.

(He who was never on board fears to steer a ship; none but a professional man dares to prescribe Southern wood for a patient; physicians undertake physicians' duty; artisans alone handle tools; but, learned and unlearned, we scribble verses all alike.)

With much more reason may the true educationist complain today that while all other professions are safeguarded by law and usage from the intrusions of quackery, the noble profession of education is often left open as a hunting ground for all comers, whilst it may be said of the educationist, with as much truth as of the poet, "*nascitur non fit*," yet a certain amount of training and of acquired knowledge is essential for every one who pretends to undertake the *rôle* of an educationist. This training ought to be acquired in a properly-appointed normal or training college, and the acquisition of it ought to be certified by an authoritative diploma. This system of certified teachers works admirably in other countries, for instance in England. There, such female Religious Congregations as undertake the work of education require as a condition, *sine qua non*, for entering the Community that the postulant shall present a teacher's certificate, in the absence of which she is relegated to the training college until such time as she obtains it. And thus, in England, the religious habit in the school room is synonymous not only with Catholicity but with competency to teach. This fact supplies to Catholic parents in England a very desirable safeguard and assurance, and the Fathers of the Plenary Council very wisely and properly insisted that the same be given to Catholic parents in the United States.

Another matter on which the Council laid much stress, is the obligation, incumbent on clergy and laity, to provide suitable school buildings and appointments. Some are inclined to think that there is among educationists a tendency to exaggerate on this point. Such persons look upon the handsome school structures erected by municipal or State authorities as woeful waste of public funds. They pretend that more modest buildings and less costly

appointments would suffice for children who are gathered, for the most part, from the alleys and by-ways of our cities, the shanties of our boroughs, and the farmhouses of our country. These and like notions are based on misconception of the true province of education, especially with regard to children. In their case education should aim not so much at imparting hard, dry knowledge, as at developing, in right directions, both mind and body. If the home surroundings of the child are narrow, cramped, dingy, slovenly, loathsome, so much the more need is there that the school counteract their pernicious effects by giving the child plenty of space to breathe, and objects of beauty to contemplate. If the child's home influence is depraving through ignorance, barbarism or vice, the school must seek to elevate him by instilling into him knowledge, culture, and morality. The example and principle of the teacher will do much to attain this threefold end, but the school building and appointments, the lofty ceiling and neat furniture, the books and maps and globes, the portraits of distinguished men and women, the views of great cities and historic scenes, the homely landscape which, perhaps, there will be no opportunity of ever seeing except in the school-room picture, the encaged bird by the window whose haunts in the woodlands will never be explored, but the memory of whose cheerful warblings will remain a joy forever, all these have a refining influence, the effect of which will be felt by the child and reflected in turn in its home surroundings. Of course, it requires large expenditure of money to effect all this.

But as we have hinted already, our generous laity will never be found backward in supplying funds, once they are convinced that their contributions will be judiciously devoted to an object so productive of the highest good as education. Relatively speaking, we would prefer to see a fine school rather than a fine church in a given parish ; for, the adult who has the Faith and who is supposed to adore God in spirit and truth, regardless of the surroundings, does not need the encouragement of external forms so much as the child needs beautiful buildings and attractive appointments to sweeten the toil of study, to foster the growth of mind and body, to enkindle love and enthuasism for high and noble ideals, and to arouse an honest pride in the school and the system under which it is being nurtured. The illustrious Cardinal Manning, on being offered, some years ago, large inducements to build a gigantic cathedral for his diocese, declined, asserting that as long as a single child of his flock walked the streets of London without suitable school accommodation he would not place a stone on the new Westminster. He has kept his word and he is right. For, more elevating than cathedral tower piercing the vault of heaven, more beautiful than groined ceiling and chiseled capitals, more

harmonious than organ peals, more resonant than many-tongued bells, richer and fresher than stained-glass windows—and, above all, more necessary than these is the elevating, the beautiful, harmonious, far-sounding, freshening, and mind-enriching influence of a well-conducted and well-equipped school.

The measures outlined above, which are in accordance with the letter and spirit of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, would secure to our parochial school system the three great requisites for success, good schools, good teachers, and good teaching. The united efforts of bishops, priests, and people could render these measures entirely feasible. Several dioceses have already adopted them with marked success. It is to be hoped that before long every diocese in the United States will have its parochial school system organized in accordance with the decrees of the Council as well as the requirements of education. Then we shall have a Catholic primary school system comprehensive enough to satisfy the ordinary avocations of life, and solid enough to bear the superstructure of higher education. Nothing less than this befits the dignity of our olden Church, nothing less can satisfy the pressing needs, or the laudable aspirations of our people. We may look forward to the day when our parochial schools in every large centre will be supplemented by free high schools carried on under the same safe provisions to secure efficiency. We shall then have an educational system complete in every part, and fit to enter the lists with richly-endowed State schools. When that day comes, the vexed educational problem will solve itself. Our schools can neither be ignored nor decried. We shall be able to challenge the State to inspect them, and to weigh their educational results in the balance of open competition with State schools. We shall then be in a position to insist that if the public funds are to be devoted to educational purposes they shall be distributed equitably among all schools regardless of dogma, but proportionate to well-attested results. We shall be able to show that our schools, whilst a source of joy and pride and lasting benefit to the Church, are a source of strength and stability to the State.

PROOFS OF THE EXISTENCE OF GOD DRAWN FROM THE METAPHYSICAL OR IDEAL ORDER.

Elementa Philosophiæ Christianæ, Auctore P. F. Alberto Lepidi, Ordinis Prædicatorum, Studiorum Regente in Collegio Lovaniensi.

THAT human reason is capable of demonstrating the existence of God is a dogma of Catholic faith. In his epistle to the Romans, St. Paul tells us that "the invisible things of Him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made: His eternal power also and divinity."[1] The late Vatican Council treating of this same question gave utterance to the following explicit definition:

"If any one say that the one true God, our Creator and Lord, cannot be known with certainty by the natural light of human reason, through those things which have been made, let him be anathema."[2]

The same truth has been asserted by the best philosophers of all the ages. Plato, Aristotle and other eminent pagan writers, who were not only destitute of the light of faith, but were moreover reared in an atmosphere of Polytheism, constrained by the force of natural evidence, admitted the existence of one Supreme Being, the source and the cause of all other beings. The bright intellects of these great men beheld God reflected in nature. Their own personal existence, the material world around them, every animal, shrub and flower which it contained were to them so many irrefragable proofs of the existence of a necessary, infinite, eternal Entity. Unlike many of the pseudo-philosophers of our day, they failed to recognize a mark of intellectual superiority in the negation of the Being whose existence is necessarily presupposed to all use of reason.

The arguments which the ancients employed in establishing God's existence were of that class denominated by the logicians *a posteriori* arguments. The process of reasoning was from effect to cause. The existence of a finite thing, they reasoned, necessarily presupposes the existence of an infinite Being. The perfections in which creatures participate in a limited degree argue the existence of the plenitude of perfection, self-subsisting perfection, perfection without limit. Whatever begins to be must have a cause; and since there cannot be an indefinite series of causes which are themselves caused, it is necessary that there be a first cause which

[1] Chapter I., v. 20.

[2] Sess. 3, de Revelatione, Can. 1.

has existence of itself. There can be no order without an intelligent ruler. Since, therefore, a truly marvellous harmony is found to prevail among all the various parts of the great known universe, there must be a Supreme Intelligence, an All-wise Law-giver, the Author and Executor of the great code of fixed laws which govern finite natures. These arguments, as is evident, are drawn from the physical order of things. They are of the species referred to by the Sacred Text and the Vatican Council. They establish the existence of God by reasoning from "the things that are made." The medium of demonstration is the actual concrete existence of contingent, finite, changeable beings. Merely possible beings, the abstract essences of things, which appertain exclusively to the ideal order, form no part of them. And as far as we can discover, nowhere in their writings do the philosophers of antiquity make use of the proofs of the existence of the Deity taken from the ideal or abstract order of things. Likewise St. Thomas Aquinas, the greatest philosopher of the Christian era, in treating of the question confines himself exclusively to the species of argumentation referred to above. No one has ever set forth more clearly or more forcibly than he the demonstrations of the existence of God drawn from the various aspects of concrete, finite things. But in vain do we seek in his works for explicit reference to a proof furnished by the metaphysical order. It is true, indeed, that he frequently asserts the principles on which such proof is based; but he nowhere explicitly formulates from these principles an argument designed to establish the existence of a necessary Infinite Being.

In more modern times a very important place is given in the works of Catholic philosophers to an argument drawn from the purely metaphysical order.[1] The medium of demonstration in this case is the essence of finite things as represented in the state of abstraction by the human mind. The argument may be thus stated: The essences of things are necessary, eternal, and immutable. Though individual men are subject to vicissitudes, though they begin to be to-day and to-morrow perish from among the things that are; the essence of man is subject to no change; its reality had no beginning and can have no end. Likewise all abstract principles founded upon the nature of things are eternal, necessary, unchangeable truths. The essence of a circle consists in this: That it is a figure, every point of whose circumference is

[1] This is especially true of the work referred to at the beginning of this article. The great aim of Father Lepidi in his *Philosophia Christiana* is evidently to make it clear that all philosophy and all science is based upon the existing Infinite as upon its foundation, and that there can be no science, no philosophy for those who deny the actual existence of the Necessary and the Infinite.

equally distant from the centre. There has been no time in which a circle was aught else than this, and there can be none. It is so independently of time. We have the fullest certitude of this truth, that if a circle at any time exist, it must of necessity conform to the type expressed in the definition just given. No power can ever effect that a circle be anything else. The same is to be said of every metaphysical principle. Take, for example, the proposition: If two things are equal to a third thing they are equal to each other. Even were there no human intellect to conceive this proposition, even were there no three existing distinct realities to which it could be applied, and, therefore, even if it could not be realized or exemplified in the concrete, it would still be the expression of an objective truth; would still be a necessary, eternal, immutable law. As a warrant for all these assertions we have evidence of the very highest order. Our intellect represents essences and the principles founded on them as realities. We have an immediate, intuitive perception of all such truths, and to deny them or any one of them is to destroy man's intellectual nature. If the objectivity of the concepts of the mind is denied in such cases as these, it must be rejected in all cases. And reason, thus shorn of the power of representing realities, becomes a worthless faculty which can no longer constitute a real difference in nature between man and the brute.

Now it is clear that metaphysical essences, and consequently the principles on which they are the basis, have no actual existence in themselves. For in the first place they are abstracted by the mind from actual existence; and secondly, they are *universal*, that is to say, they can be predicated of many individuals, and it is absurd to suppose that an actually existing thing can be many at the same time. The opinion that ideal essences possess actual being has, indeed, had its defenders among the philosophers of past ages; but it has long since been abandoned as a gross absurdity. It is equally clear that such essences are not mere *nothings*. For, as has been said above, they are objects of the intellect which apprehends and understands them. A pure nonentity cannot be the object of the mind. Being and intelligibilty are correlative, and nothing can be conceived by the mind which does not possess being either in itself or in something else which contains it. Since, therefore, these metaphysical essences and the laws which arise from them have no actual being in and of themselves; since, moreover, they have being in some way, and since eternity, necessity, and immutability really belong to them as properties, it follows as a legitimate consequence that there must be an actually existent Eternal, Necessary and Immutable Being of which they are but possible participations. They are, as it

were, founded on the actual essence of this Self-existent Being which contains within itself the types, and the exemplars, and the laws of all other things which exist or can exist, and which possesses, moreover, the power necessary to create; the power of communicating actual entity in various degrees of perfection to an indefinite number of finite possible things.

There is but little of the sensible element in this process of reasoning, and consequently its force or convincing power cannot be vividly felt by those who are not accustomed to deal in abstractions. It is, for all that, an apodictical demonstration. And those whose minds are wont to roam in the realms of metaphysics can discern and realize the necessary connection between conclusion and premises in the argumentation quite as readily as in any of the others which philosophers and theologians employ to establish the existence of the Infinite.

As to the classification of the argument just developed, some would doubtless call it *a posteriori* reasoning. For though the essences of things be not the effects of the Divine will, or of God's creative power, yet the essence of God may be said to be the cause of them, inasmuch as it is the foundation on which they are based. It seems to us, however, that this reasoning may more correctly be denominated *a simultaneo*. It is evidently nothing else than an analysis of our ideas of finite essences. All admit that they have no being in themselves, and that they exist only in the essence of God, of which they are possible participations. When, therefore, they are expressed by the human mind it is in truth the Divine reality as participable according to this or that mode, which is the object represented. Of course, we would not be understood as asserting that the human mind has an intuitive knowledge of God's essence as it is in itself. That is ontologistic and false. But we do claim that all metaphysical concepts represent under a created, analogical similitude or image the being of God as capable of being participated in by creatures. It is that and nothing else which the intellect manifests when it conceives the nature of man in the abstract or any other ideal essence. In all such conceptions the existence of God is implicitly asserted. A simple analysis, then, of our concepts of finite essences shows us the necessary existence of the Infinite Being.

There is but one serious objection that can be made against the proof laid down above, and though that one has already been to some extent anticipated in the foregoing remarks, we propose to give it here fuller consideration and to answer it more explicitly, realizing that this answer must affect very materially what we have yet to say concerning another metaphysical proof of the existence of God. It is the objection made by Kant and by subjectivists

generally. Metaphysical essences and abstract concepts of whatsoever nature, say they, are nothing else than subjective forms. They are the frame-work of our intellects, laws of our minds. They have, and can have, no corresponding objective reality. This being so, they cannot serve as a medium by which we may demonstrate the existence of something real. The reasoning employed above is logical, indeed, they continue, but since it is based on a false supposition, to wit, the objectivity of concepts which in truth, are merely subjective, it is utterly worthless and fails to effect the purpose for which its advocates employ it. From the premises there laid down we may logically deduce the *mental* or *conceptual* evidence of God—a Supreme Being in the ideal order—but by no means are we warranted in inferring from these premises the actual existence of an Infinite Being in the order of physical realities.

The objection here proposed embodies the fundamental principle which underlies the transcendental idealism of Kant and all the kindred pernicious systems of philosophy which are in vogue at the present day. If that principle be admitted, it is not alone the metaphysical proof of the existence of God that is destroyed; the admission of it involves the total destruction of human reason. There is and there can be no process of reasoning without the metaphysical element. And when it is asserted that this element is unreal, that it is entirely subjective, the basis of every science, the foundation of all knowledge, is annihilated by one fell blow. Man's intellect is thus made the victim of idle illusions; the sport of empty dreams. All the speculations of the philosophers are declared to be vain hallucinations. All our lofty ideals of goodness and beauty and truth are placed on a par with the maniac's ravings.

This *reductio ad absurdum* would preclude all possibility of the acceptance of the doctrine of the subjectivists by sensible unprejudiced men, even if no direct refutation of it could be offered. However, such a refutation readily suggests itself. Evidence is the criterion of truth; and we have the clearest, brightest evidence of the objective reality of our metaphysical conceptions. That same light which exhibits to us the existence of a concept in our minds manifests the essentially representative nature of such concept; tells us of the existence of a reality for the expression of which such concept was designed and instituted by nature. All men readily distinguish between the conception of *being* and that of *nothing;* between that of *real being* and that of *ens rationis* which is purely mental, as, for instance, a negation of the relation between subject and predicate in a proposition.

It may be urged that no explanation can be given as to the origin of these metaphysical concepts; that all *real* or *true* knowl-

edge, since it is a representation of a real object, must necessarily be produced by the action of such object upon our cognoscitive faculties; and since these ideal objects, according to admission made above, have no real existence in themselves, they cannot be capable of such action; cannot, therefore, beget in our minds an image which may represent them. Concrete sensible things can do this. They really act upon our senses, and of them and them alone we can have true and objective knowledge.

Our answer to this is, that the question as to the origin of our ideas of supersensible things is entirely irrelevant to the discussion of our present subject. That we possess them, is a fact of consciousness. We know that we have them. There can be no more doubt on that point than on the question of our own existence. How we have come by them is a question which cannot be discussed here. Philosophers entertain widely different views on that subject. But no matter how the question may be decided, no matter what solution may be offered, the *fact* must remain unimpaired, that we actually have in our minds, ideas representing metaphysical essences, and representing them as entirely independent of every created intellect in the matter of objective reality.

We enter now upon the consideration of another metaphysical proof of the existence of God; and though firmly convinced of the validity of the demonstration, we must confess that we are not without some misgivings as to the reception which it will meet with among the learned. The scholastics have always looked with disfavor upon the celebrated ontological argument of St. Anselm. That they are justified in refusing to accept that argument seems to us quite evident. The reasoning of the saint is defective because of the unwarranted transition from the ideal to the real order. The idea of actual existence is necessarily contained in the metaphysical concept of the most perfect being. As will be more fully explained further on, the argument of St. Anselm simply asserts this fact, but it fails to furnish sufficient reason why we should affirm that there is an objective reality outside the mind corresponding in every respect to the mental concept. Precisely the same is to be said of the argumentation employed by Descartes. It also is sophistical for the reason just assigned. In truth, it is not a new argument, substantially different from that of St. Anselm. It is the same reasoning proposed in a somewhat different form; and in this new form it falls quite as far short of effecting its purpose as it did in the hands of its original author. The failure of these illustrious philosophers to construct upon our conception of the Infinite a satisfactory proof of God's existence, very naturally causes men to look with distrust upon every similar attempt. Notwithstanding this well grounded and universal prejudice, we venture to

put forth an ontological proof of the existence of God, based upon the human conception of the Infinite, considering it as valid and as irrefragable as any one of the time-honored demonstrations employed by Theist philosophers.

It may be laid down as a principle, and it cannot be too strongly insisted upon, that the object, and the only object, of the human intellect is *ens*, *being*. *Non-entity*, *nothing*, cannot be manifested or represented; cannot be the object of a mind. That alone can be conceived which has entity in some sense. We say *in some sense* because we do not wish to exclude from the category of things which can be represented by the mind those purely mental beings which are called *entia rationis*. We can and we do conceive and reason about such things as *negation*, *privation*, relation of subject to predicate in a proposition, and many other similar things which cannot possess real existence. But when it is clearly understood in what sense or in what way we conceive these things, the truth of our principle becomes yet more manifest. Every one knows that there is no such thing as a negation existing in nature, either actually or potentially. Whatever is, is a positive something. The privation of sight, in itself, is not a real being, but rather the want, the absence of something real. Moreover, these objects of the mind cannot be represented or known by the mind in themselves. Their cognoscibility is in exact proportion to their entity. They can consequently be known only in conjunction with a real being. Thus, when we conceive blindness, we consider a real subject destitute of the power of seeing. It is thus evident that in such a conception we manifest two real entities, which by a mental process we separate from each other. But a privation or a negation as such is objectively a non-entity, and therefore as such cannot be an object of intellectual conception. Only a real being then can be *per se* manifested by the mind of man. And it is evident, consequently, that whatever the intellect conceives as real being must necessarily be a real thing; must exist either in itself or in the power of a cause which can bring it forth from nothing.

Now, consciousness tells us that we have an idea of the Infinite, an idea which represents the plenitude of being; the sum, as it were, of all perfection. That idea is not an agglomeration of the various concepts which manifest all the actual and possible finite things. Neither is it the idea of *ens* in general, as abstracted from particular modes of being. This latter is something vague, indeterminate, universal, which can be predicated of numberless entities. On the contrary, our idea of the Infinite has for its object a particular, individual, simple, all-perfect *Ens*, embracing and containing in itself every possible perfection; in a word, that object is *Ipsum Esse*. Such an idea every philosopher professes to have

when he undertakes to prove the existence of God even by the *a posteriori* method. He does not seek to establish the existence of a vague, indefinite thing, but of a determinate, concrete object.

It matters not whence this idea comes. It matters not that it is imperfect and finite. It matters not for the present whether it represents its object as it exists in itself or in some created similitude which is merely analogous to it. We are concerned just now with a fact only. And it is an undeniable fact that we possess an idea which respects as its object a supremely Perfect Being. If to this fact we apply the principle stated above, viz., that the mind can manifest nothing but *reality*, it becomes equally clear and undeniable that this Supreme and most Perfect Being is a reality—a real entity.

Now real beings, as was said above, are of two classes. They are either actually existent or merely possible. It is self-evident that the infinite cannot be a *possible* reality; for what cause could contain or produce it? It remains, therefore, that it is an actual reality, that it really exists in itself.

Deny this conclusion and, it seems to us the whole fabric of philosophy must totter and fall. No structure can stand when its foundation has been swept from beneath it. All philosophy, all reasoning—we repeat it again—is based upon this principle, that the intellect is a faculty whose nature it is to manifest *truth;* whose only object is being or reality. It is for the subversion of this principle that Hume and Kant and skeptics and subjectivists generally have labored. To that end, above all, have they directed their efforts. And if it be once granted by Catholic philosophers that the mind can manifest *nothing*, or that any one of its concepts may be destitute of an order to reality, then, it seems to us, they make an unconditional surrender and give over the field to their adversaries. Such a concession they would certainly make were they to deny the conclusion drawn from that principle and from our idea of the Infinite as from its premises; for, that conclusion is a legitimate and necessary inference and can be evaded only by a flat denial of the principle from which it is deduced.

Catholic philosophers are all willing to admit, are even firm in maintaining against Kant and his school, that our conceptions of finite beings in the ideal order manifest realities. They all readily grant and strenously contend that even if no circle existed it would yet be a necessary, eternal, immutable truth that all the radii of a circle are equal; that even if there were no man in existence it would still be an unchangeable law that man is a rational animal; that he *can* exist, and that if he exist he must necessarily possess the nature and the properties of a rational animal. Of course, they cannot demonstrate these assertions. And yet in

laying them down as truths they are guilty of no unjustifiable assumptions. These truths are represented as objective by the mind. Their objectivity is manifested in the light of evidence. It is based on the clear and self-evident principle that the intellect is ordered by nature to the manifestation of truth or reality. No one of the scholastics would contend that in these cases there is an unjustifiable *transitus* from the ideal to the real order. All will concede that a sufficient reason for that transition is contained in the principle so often stated above. The mere fact that the intellect represents finite ideal things is the only reason for concluding that such things are, or may become, actual entities; that they either exist in themselves or else are contained in some cause which can produce them and make them to exist in the concrete. Why, then, may not this same principle be employed in the same way and for the same purpose and with the same effect when there is question of our idea of the Infinite?

It will, perhaps, be said that the argument here proposed differs not from that put forth by St. Anselm centuries ago; an argument which St. Thomas rejected as sophistical, and which, until this day has found no defender among the scholastic philosophers and theologians. We claim, however, that there is a most marked difference between the two processes of argumentation, and even at the risk of repeating something that has already been said, we propose to point out clearly in what that difference consists. In order to do this it will be necessary to state the Anselmic argument in substance. Its deficiency can then be seen more readily. It may be thus summed up: The greatest and best object which can be conceived possesses actual existence; for, that which exists actually is certainly greater than that which exists merely in thought. And since God is, according to all, an Infinite Being greater than which none can be conceived, it follows that he exists actually *in re*.[1]

Now it is evident that in this argument there is assigned no reason for the transition from the subjective or ideal to the objective or real. It is asserted simply that the metaphysical concept of the most Perfect contains the metaphysical concept of existence. The conceptual definition of God is laid down: God is Supreme Perfection essentially existing. But we seek in vain for some motive, some *ratio sufficiens*, which leads us to conclude that this

[1] In the author's own words it runs thus: Certe id quo majus cogitari nequit, non potest esse in intellectu solo; si enim vel in solo intellectu est, potest cogitari esse et in re, quod majus est. Si ergo id quo majus cogitari non potest est in solo intellectu, id ipsum quo majus cogitari non potest est quo majus cogitari potest. Sed certo hoc esse non potest. Existit ergo procul dubio aliquid quo majus cogitari non valet et in intellectu et in re.

concept is realized in the concrete. No reference is made to such a principle as that which has been so strongly insisted upon here : the principle, namely, of the objectivity of the human concept, which, as it were, bridges over the chasm between the ideal and the real and thereby furnishes us a means of transit. Because St. Anselm introduced no such element into his argument, because he failed to show that whatever is *per se* the object of the mind necessarily pertains in some way to the real order or the order of realities, we maintain with all the scholastics that his reasoning was imperfect and defective. Precisely the same is to be said of the reason employed by Descartes. As we remarked above, it is not really different from the one which we have just discussed. Descartes but proposed the argument of St. Anselm under a new form, and failed to remedy the defect which vitiates it and renders it useless.

In order to bring out yet more clearly the idea for which we are contending, we proceed to formulate the objection which, having till now been employed with telling effect against Descartes and St. Anselm, may naturally suggest itself as militating with equal force against us in the position which we have taken in this article. It may be said that if this reasoning be correct and the argument here exposed be valid, the intellect of man is rendered incapable of error. Whatever it conceives must necessarily be; consequently, from the very fact that we have a conception of any given object, no matter how grotesque, ridiculous and chimerical, it follows that such object must be assigned a place among realities. No other criterion of objective truth is required than the subjective conception —the psychological fact that an idea exists in an intellect. Now every one who enjoys the use of reason knows that this is false and absurd. We can represent in our minds a living man with a head of gold. The materialist conceives the human soul as a material substance. There is no limit to the number of chimeras which can be excogitated by the intellect and which can in no way exist in external nature. It is, therefore, illogical to infer from a mental concept the reality of the object which it represents. The " Infinite " which we conceive must then be regarded as a mere chimera or *ens rationis* until its actual existence shall have been demonstrated by the customary process of *a posteriori* reasoning.

Before attempting to answer this seeming difficulty we would call attention to the fact that the same objection may be brought against all those who claim objective reality in any sense whatsoever for our intellectual conceptions of abstract things. All the scholastics and sound philosophers in general proclaim that even if no concrete circle existed with which the ideal could be compared, it would yet be an immutable truth that a circle is just what we

now conceive it to be, and moreover, that a circle would be a possible entity, something capable of existing in nature. These things they could not demonstrate by *a posteriori* reasoning in the hypothesis. Of course, if a circle be supposed to exist in the concrete, its eternal possibility is self-evident—*ab actu ad posse valet consecutio.* When, however, it is assumed, as we are assuming, that no concrete example is to be had, such reasoning cannot be employed. Consequently, all the aforesaid philosophers would, in such an hypothesis, have to seek elsewhere the reason for the objective reality of such thought. They would be forced to show by reasoning from some other standpoint that an abstract circle is not an *ens rationis* or a chimera incapable of realization in nature.

We readily admit that in this they would have a very easy task; and the solution which they would be forced to give to the difficulty as proposed, is precisely the same as that which we offer when the same objection is brought against us to demonstrate the futility of our seeking to show the actual existence of God from the human mind's concept of an Infinite Being. It is absolutely false that there can be a concept or a mental representation of that which neither exists nor can exist. Whatever is represented by the mind as a real being *is* a real being either actual or possible. In this sense the assertion made above, "Whatever the mind conceives must necessarily be," is most certainly true. This has already been shown with sufficient clearness. All that remains now is to point out that the examples adduced in the objection, in nowise contradict the principle just enumerated. A rustic may tell us that he can conceive a square triangle, or a figure which, at the same time and viewed under the same aspect is square and triangular, but every one will know that he is mistaken; that he conceives no such thing; that he is ignorant of the nature of one or of both of these figures. Likewise, if any one say that he conceives a man with a golden head, we all know that he is in error. He is ignorant of the nature of man. If regard be had to conformation of parts only, he can certainly form an intellectual conception of a gold-headed object having the shape of a human being; but he can no more conceive a living rational animal with a head of gold than he can conceive a "triangular square." The materialist really has a conception of material substance as we all have, and such substance is, therefore, at least, a possible entity. He may also conceive the soul as the principle of life and operations in man, and this, too, is a reality. He can combine the two in one conception only through ignorance of the nature of one or of both. Chimeras of the class referred to cannot, therefore, be represented in the mind. And the reason is because they involve repugnance. They have and can have no entity; cannot, therefore, be conceived.

There is another class of chimerical beings which do not actually exist, and yet are possible things. A man with feet like to those of a horse, though a monstrosity, is capable of being produced by the creative power of God. A man having some sort of wings can be created and be made capable of flying. Such things are contained in the power of a cause. Though they have no being in themselves, no actual existence, they are potential entities and can, consequently, be objects of intellectual conception.

From the reply just given it is evident that we do not claim absolute infallibility for the human intellect. Men can and do err through ignorance, want of consideration, and failure to use properly the cognoscitive faculties which nature has given them, as for instance, the external senses. It is equally evident, however, that the intellect is *per se* infallible. And above all, it is evident that it is not essentially untrustworthy, as it most surely would be in the hypothesis that it can ever represent aught else than *reality*. And from all this it appears to us quite clear that the only way to elude the force of the argument, as stated above, is to deny that we have any idea of the Infinite at all, and such a denial is too clearly absurd to merit the slightest serious consideration.

A word now as to the position which St. Thomas occupied with relation to the proof here employed. The fact that the Angelic Doctor rejected the reasoning of St. Anselm as insufficient, in no way places him in opposition to the ontological argument as proposed in this paper. This is evident from the wide disparity which we have shown to exist between the two processes. As was remarked at the outset, St. Thomas did not explicitly state the metaphysical proof of God's existence which is based on the essences of finite things—on the eternity, necessity and immutability of the ideal order. All will confess, however, that he did lay down explicitly the great principle which underlies that method of argumentation. It is equally certain that he gave expression to the principles which constitute the foundation of the reasoning we have here employed. Indeed, the fundamental principle in both cases is precisely the same. No one can claim that possible finite things, as conceived by the intellect, necessarily demonstrate the actual existence of the Infinite, unless it first be admitted with St. Thomas that it is of the nature of the intellect that it manifest being—"ut rebus conformetur" [Qu. i., de Veritate, a 9]; and that "intelligibile est *res*" [contra Gent. Lib. 1, c. 43, edit. Urcelli]. And it is in these very truths that we find the *ratio sufficiens* of deducing the actual existence of God from the idea of the Infinite which dwells in the human mind. It is true, St. Thomas denies that the existence of God can be proved *a priori*. But so do we. He says it cannot be proved by that

demonstration *quæ est per causam, et dicitur propter quid et est per priora simpliciter* [I^a. P. Qu. 2, a. 2]. In this we heartily concur. And it is not claimed that the argument developed above belongs to the species of demonstration which the Angel of the Schools describes in the words just quoted. Our ontological proof is rather an analysis of the idea of the Infinite, just as the one given further back, is an analysis of ideal finite things. For the same reason which was assigned above for the classification of the first, the second may also be termed a *demonstratio a simultaneo.*

In order that it may be more readily understood, we now sum up in a few words the metaphysical proof drawn from the idea of the Infinite: We have an idea of the Infinite. That is evident from our own consciousness. Every idea represents *ens* or being; either *ens rationis* or *ens reale.* If this principle be denied, we must all become subjectivists. It is clear that the object of our idea of the Infinite is no more an *ens rationis* than is the object of our abstract concept of *homo.* It must, therefore, represent a real being, *ens reale.* Now *ens reale* is of two kinds. It is either merely possible or actually existent. It is absurd to talk about the Infinite as merely possible, or as contained in the power of a cause. Therefore, the *ens reale* which is manifested in that idea is an actually existent being. Therefore, God exists.

FRANCIS DE MONTMORENCY-LAVAL, BISHOP OF QUEBEC.

VIE DE MGR. DE LAVAL, Premier Evêque de Québec, et Apôtre du Canada, 1622–1708. Par *l'Abbé Auguste Gosselin,* Docteur dès-Lettres de l'Université Laval. 2 vols. Quebec. 1890.

IF it be a good fortune for a biographer to happen upon a life so intensely and so widely interesting as that of the great American bishop, whose career is described in these two exhaustive volumes, the American reader will, on laying them down, say that the apostolic prelate was not a little fortunate in finding such a biographer. This work fills what has been hitherto felt by scholars as a great void in the early history of the Church in Canada.

The name of Francis de Montmorency-Laval is now made doubly dear, since the Holy See has just solemnly authorized the proceedings begun at Rome for the canonization of him whom the Abbé Gosselin styles "the Apostle of Canada."

Assuredly, the episcopal career which began on December 8, 1658, and ended at Quebec on May 6, 1708, was adorned by all the virtues of the apostle and the saint. The sweet odor of sanctity left behind by this illustrious man at his death, nearly two centuries ago, filled all Quebec and all Canada when we first touched their shores in 1832. This fragrance of an angelic life, and the fame won by deeds of immortal beneficence, have been increasing ever since. The institutions of learning which he created in the ancient capital of New France have blossomed, at length, like the century plant, into the great university which bears his name.

It is a wonderful, a fascinating, and a most edifying story of goodness, of self-sacrifice, of the sublime heroism inspired by religion, and of that all-sufficing creative power wielded by true sanctity, which the two volumes before us unfold.

I.

Francis de Montmorency-Laval was born in the village of Montigny-sur-Avre, in the diocese of Chartres, on April 30, 1622. Montigny was one of four estates or lordships belonging to his father, Hugh de Laval. Matthew de Montmorency, surnamed the Great, who died in 1230, had for his second wife Emma de Laval, the only child and heiress of the Baron Guy de Laval. From this union came Guy de Montmorency-Laval, the ancestor of the first

bishop of Quebec. His elder brother, Bouchard, whose mother was a daughter of the Count de Soissons, continued the line of the Montmorencys.

Francis was the third son of Hugh de Laval. The family was a deeply Christian one, both father and mother giving the most edifying examples of living faith and piety. Reared in such a home, Francis manifested from his childhood a decided love for the sanctuary. When in his ninth year, in October, 1630, he was sent to the Jesuit school of Laflèche, where he made great progress in letters as well as in piety. His two elder brothers having embraced a military career, Francis was destined to the Church, assumed the clerical dress and tonsure, as was the custom of the times and country, and was created by the Bishop of Evreux, a near maternal relative, a canon of his cathedral. Thenceforth, he was known as the Abbé de Montigny. From the college of Laflèche the young Abbé, having completed his classical course, passed to the Collége de Clermont, in Paris, also directed by the Jesuits. There he pursued his studies in philosophy and theology. About 1640, the celebrated Jesuit missionary, Alexander de Rhodes, arrived on a first visit to Paris, soliciting recruits for the distant missions of China and Tonkin. The appeals, conversations, and saintly life of Father de Rhodes, made a deep impression on Francis de Laval and his fellow-students. The young scion of the Montmorencys would have, at once, offered himself for the work of the apostolate in the far East. But deaths had just occurred in his own family which seemed likely to change totally his own career.

His father died in 1640; his oldest brother fell in the great battle of Fribourg, on August 3, 1644, and just a twelvemonth later, his other brother was killed in the battle of Nordlingen. These sad accidents made Francis de Laval the head of his family, and the mainstay of his widowed mother and her remaining children.

The advice of the Bishop of Evreux, and that of the Jesuits of the College of Clermont, induced Francis to forego, for a time at least, his purpose of becoming a priest. So he returned to Montigny, and regulated with great tact and practical wisdom the family estates. Just then, in July, 1646, the Bishop of Evreux died, and on his death-bed expressed his regret at having urged Francis to give up his vocation. He, therefore, made the young man promise that he would return to his calling, and the better to enable him to pursue it he appointed him Archdeacon of Evreux.

He at once renounced, in favor of his only remaining brother, John Louis, all his own claims to the family estates and honors, and, with his pious mother's consent and blessing, prepared to

receive holy orders. He also further qualified himself for the discharge of his duties as archdeacon by taking out his degrees in Canon Law in the University of Paris.

Providence, however, had chosen Francis de Laval for a wider field of labor than the diocese of Evreux. A second visit of Father de Rhodes to France, in 1652, led the archdeacon and several of his old college companions to place themselves at the disposal of the great missionary, offering to follow him to the remotest regions of Asia. De Rhodes and his companions proceeded at once to Rome, where Innocent X. greeted them most cordially. The names of Francis de Laval and of Messrs. Pallu and Picquet were submitted to the Holy See for the episcopal office and the dignity of Vicars-Apostolic in upper Asia; de Laval, in particular, to be Vicar-Apostolic of Tonkin. The proposition was favorably received by the Pope, and the whole project was referred by him to the cardinals. The thing was looked upon as settled. Francis de Laval, on December 7, 1653, signed in Rome a formal renunciation of his dignity of archdeacon, and held himself in readiness for his new and perilous mission.

Thereupon the court of Portugal, which claimed the prerogative of high patronage over all the churches of India and upper Asia, protested against the proposed appointment of the Vicars-Apostolic. And so the whole scheme was set aside for the moment. Meanwhile, Francis de Laval returned to France, and withdrew to a half-monastic retreat for fervent priests established at Caen by John de Bernières, one of the wealthy and saintly laymen so common in the France of the seventeenth century. He there devoted himself to the service of the poor and of the sick in the hospitals, practicing with ever-increasing fervor all those virtues of self denial and self-sacrifice which prepare apostolic men for their work among the Heathen. This house in Caen was called "The Hermitage," and was one adjoining the Ursuline Convent. Fervent priests and fervent laymen lived there together, encouraging each other by word and example to the pursuit of Christian perfection. Among them were men destined to be, in Canada, the zealous fellow-workers of the first bishop of Quebec. It was in the "Hermitage," at Caen, that the choice of the Holy See confirming the request of the young king, Louis XIV., and of Anne of Austria, the Queen Regent of France, found Francis de Laval, in the autumn of 1658. He was appointed Vicar-Apostolic of New France, with the title of Bishop of Petra.

This appointment raised in France quite a storm of opposition. The archbishops of Rouen, because the first priests sent to Canada had sailed from a port in their diocese, had taken it on themselves, without any reference to the Holy See, to claim exclusive spiritual

jurisdiction over the vast countries drained by the St. Lawrence and its affluents. The advice of the then Archbishop of Rouen had not been sought either by the French government or by the Court of Rome in the nomination or appointment of Mgr. de Laval. This was declared to be an abuse of the papal prerogative, and a violation of "the liberties" of the Gallican Church. So both the parliament of Rouen and that of Paris were appealed to by the indignant archbishop, and a solemn decree was thereupon issued forbidding any French bishop giving episcopal consecration to the Vicar-Apostolic elect.

The Papal Nuncio in Paris, however, Mgr. Piccolomini, took on himself to perform the rite; and so on December 8, 1658, in the beautiful abbey church of St. Germain des Prés, Francis de Laval was consecrated Bishop of Petra. On Easter Sunday, April 13, 1659, the missionary bishop, with four companions, two of them priests and two noble laymen eager for the apostleship, set sail from La Rochelle. Landing at Percé, on May 16th following, Mgr. de Laval had the happiness of solemnly confirming there one hundred and forty persons whom the devoted Jesuit missionaries had prepared for the sacrament. More than one-half of this number were French or of French parentage; the others were Indian converts. It was the first great joy which the young prelate's heart had tasted on that soil of the New World, so ardently looked forward to. He arrived at Quebec at sunset on June 16th, and landed the next morning amid the rejoicings of the mixed population of French colonists and native Indians. Quebec, then, counted only five hundred inhabitants, the total European population, of what was called New France, amounting to about 2200.

But it was on the conversion of the unnumbered Indian tribes that the Vicar-Apostolic had set his heart. To win these to Christ was the hope and the desire of his life thenceforth.

II.

He faced his gigantic work with the spirit of a Francis Xavier. On the vessel which bore him to the shores of New France, Mgr. de Laval imitated to the letter the humility and charity of the great apostle of India and Japan. His devotion to the sick and plague-stricken only increased with age. In the long voyages across the Atlantic, which, in after years, he had to undertake, he rendered the most touching services to his unfortunate fellow-travellers. It was of no account to him that the sick he thus ministered to, either did not appreciate his supernatural motives, or treated him with contemptuous ingratitude.

On his arrival in Quebec his eyes sought out the representatives of the various Indian tribes who had flocked thither to greet him.

The heart of the apostolic man went forth to them with an irresistible impulse. One young Christian Huron was dying in his tent. The bishop hastened to him; and, forgetful of everything but the immortal soul there waiting for our "Orient from on high," he and his interpreter prepared the dying man, and let in on his mind and heart, in fuller measure, the light of the gospel. Mgr. de Laval knelt by that death bed, washed with his own hands the feet he was about to anoint for the last journey, and then administered Extreme Unction. He gave the Indians precedence everywhere in the solemn religious ceremonies celebrated at his coming. They were placed first in the pro-cathedral in the ranks of those to be confirmed. And, to win back to the fold these stray sheep, he prepared for all the Indians present in Quebec a sumptuous banquet, in which, at his own expense, the proud but sensual natives partook of every delicacy most coveted by the Indian appetite.

In returning thanks to the Vicar-Apostolic, the chosen Huron orator called him *l'homme de la grande affaire*—"the man of the great concern." It was not a misnomer. Francis de Laval was devoted to but one concern during the entire half century Providence destined him to labor in Canada, the salvation of the Indian tribes, and, as the chief help toward that end, the sanctification of his clergy and the French colonists.

He had set his soul on treading firmly in the footsteps of St. Francis Xavier. In Quebec, as at Caen, he visited and comforted the sick and infirm, rendering them the lowliest services. Scarcely had he set foot in Quebec, than he hastened to the Hotel Dieu. The likeness which the sufferers there bore to the Son of God, drew him toward them with irresistible power. No entreaties, no representations were able to prevent him from taking up his lodging at the end of the sick ward, and to daily serve the patients in the humblest way.

"His heroic devotion to them[1] was a most eloquent sermon. One day, in this same Hotel Dieu of Quebec, some thirty Protestant patients, who had been admitted to the ward, were so touched by the charity of the man of God, that they abjured their errors, and were received into the Church.[2]

The descendant of the Montmorencys bore during the long crusade he had undertaken to spread the Holy Name, the same armor and weapons used by his admired patron, Xavier. His faithful valet, Houssard, who never quitted him during the last twenty years of his life, tells us, in his manuscript memoirs, that amid the cruel sufferings of all this period, and the preternatural activity displayed by the saintly prelate, he continually wore the

[1] At the time many were suffering from the awful "purple fever."

[2] Gosselin, ii., 591.

hair shirt to which he had been accustomed from the beginning of his priestly career. All through the last years of his life this excruciating hair shirt quitted him neither night nor day. "Then," says Frère Houssard, "the hair shirt which he took off with so much secrecy at night, lest I should see it, he was too weak to divest himself of. But whenever I dressed the cauterized sore on his arm, he took great care that I should not discover his secret."[1]

He would never sleep on a soft bed. "When he saw that, in pity for his broken health, they put a soft mattress over his hard paillasse, the good bishop would wait till his valet had retired, and then take away the mattress. In the morning (and he always rose at 2 o'clock) he put the mattress back again." "His meals were to the last degree simple and frugal; I may indeed say without exaggeration, that his whole life was one long fast. He never breakfasted, and at night partook of a very slight collation." His long and fatiguing walks through the pathless Canadian forests, and the extremes of heat and cold, and of hardships of every description to which he joyously exposed himself, together with his habitual abstinence and other rigorous penitential austerities, brought on premature stomach disorders, heart failure, and running sores in both feet. These infirmities led him, when he had scarcely passed his sixtieth year to resign his see. It was an unfortunate step. For, with the exception of a few years, during which his successor was able to perform the laborious duties of administering so vast a diocese, Providence allowed the burthen of the episcopal functions to fall on Mgr. de Laval.

Nothing seemed capable of dismaying the indomitable old man, when the need of souls called for his active co-operation. Then neither the disabled feet, nor the ruined stomach prevented him from undertaking, in a frail bark canoe, even the long journey on water from Quebec to Montreal, or the painful tramp on foot to some nearer parish where Confirmation had to be given.

We have said that his austerities brought on a premature old age. Can anything be premature in the existence and life-labors of men who are only led by the Spirit of God? It did not take twenty years of the life of Francis de Montmorency Laval to fill both Old and New France with the fame of his heroic labors and and the sweet odor of his sanctity.

Such, then, was the man who, in June, 1659, came to govern and evangelize under the immediate authority of the Holy See the vast regions drained by the St. Lawrence, the Missouri and the Mississippi, and extending northward as far as Hudson's Bay. As his Vicariate-Apostolic and afterwards the Bishopric of Quebec,

[1] *Ibidem*, 604.

embraced in its jurisdiction all the regions of the North American continent dependent on the crown of France at the date of its erection, Bishop de Laval's pastoral care extended not only to the vast countries drained by the St. Lawrence and the great lakes, but to those watered by the Missouri, the Mississippi and their affluents. Impossible as it was for him to evangelize or visit in person these immense territories, his apostolic zeal urged or encouraged the Jesuit missionaries, the secular priests of his Quebec seminary, and the Sulpicians of Montreal, to plant missions around the Gulf of St. Lawrence, on both sides of the mighty stream, on the shores of the great lakes, and along the headwaters of the Hudson. It was with his blessing that Marquette went forth on the apostolic errand which cost him his life. When successive fires had burned down his seminary at Quebec, the venerable prelate melted his last pieces of plate to make a ciborium and a monstrance for one of the Jesuit missions in our northwestern territory. The instructions which he drew up for the secular priests sent to help the Jesuits in their gigantic labors, are worthy of being graven on gold tablets for the instruction of all priests on the mission.

It may be truly said of him so justly styled "the Apostle of Canada," that through his spirit he lived and labored in every one of the holy men who scattered, from 1658 till 1708, the seeds of the gospel truths and virtues over so large a portion of our country.

It is, however, the labor bestowed by Mgr. de Laval in cultivating what we might call his "home field," the valley of the St. Lawrence from Cape Gaspé and the shores of Labrador to the confluence of the Ottawa with its mighty neighbor, that the descendant of the Montmorencys displayed his indomitable courage and pastoral zeal. This home-field is upward of six hundred miles in length. It is on record that Bishop de Laval visited every single settlement then existing along both shores of the St. Lawrence, from Tadoussac to the Lake of the Two Mountains, nine times while he was Vicar-Apostolic and Bishop of Quebec, and several times thereafter, in his old age, and while his successor was a prisoner in England!

We must not forget that all these pastoral visitations had to be made, for the most part, if not always, in a bark canoe, exposed to the extremes of heat and cold of a Canadian climate, to the continual torture in summer of mosquitoes and other poisonous insects, and to the no less continual risk of being overtaken by the savage Iroquois, who then terrorized the Canadian settlement.

In the autumn of 1659 Quebec was almost closely besieged by this ferocious enemy. Yet no sooner had the danger become less threatening than the intrepid Bishop set out with one of his priests

in a bark canoe, bearing with him for his episcopal insignia a simple rochet and camail with the plainest of mitres and a wooden crozier. . . . . He, as his historian remarks, was one of those "golden bishops" (*Eveques a'or*) so praised in the early ages of the Church.

But wherever he was, at Quebec or Montreal, or while visiting some infant settlement in the forest, the holy man only distinguished himself from the missionaries around him by doing more work than any of them, or by taking on himself to perform what was more painful and fatiguing. There were but very few horses in the entire colony. In summer the Bishop and his companion had to tramp on foot through the forest. In winter he learned to use snow-shoes. In these first years of his apostolate he would start out to visit the distant sick, to baptize infants, or to give confirmation and the last sacraments to the dying, alone with a guide, carrying in a pack on his back, vestments, portable altar and sacred vessels. His charity for his flock was like a consuming flame. It communicated its divine ardor to the priests who beheld him at work; it kindled the hearts of his people. But it wasted rapidly the earthly vessel that contained it.

Francis de Laval stood six feet high; he was a man of majestic and commanding presence. But his noble features were lit up with that unearthly radiance which holiness of life and austerity impart to the countenance of men of God. It was of little use to warn the young Bishop, when he began his giant race of devotion and suffering that he was impairing his health. Who could prevent our Lord from spending His nights in vigil and prayer on the hill-tops, after His long days of wasting missionary labor in Galilee or Judea?

Whatever may be thought or said of the motives which animated the men who first entered the Gulf of St. Lawrence and planted the white-lilied flag of France on the lordly heights of Quebec and Montreal, it is certain that, in the minds of the French sovereigns who were the founders of New France, there was the sincere and firm purpose that the colony should be a model one, thoroughly Christian, and thoroughly Catholic. The various companies organized for the purpose of opening up the country to civilization were, in the main, composed of men to whom pecuniary gain was only a very secondary object. The first governors sent from France were also chosen because of their distinguished virtue. And, to do them justice, they proved themselves to be true Christian men, as we may instance in the case of the pious De Montmagny, who welcomed the Venerable Marie de l'Incarnation, on August 1, 1639; and of the no less pious D'Argenson, who received Mgr. de Laval. The politico-religious principles which had

obtained so long in the kingdom of St. Louis, were one source of the moral mischief done to New France during the reigns of *Le Grand Monarque* and his immediate successor. The other causes were—the unscrupulous greed of gain among the French traders; the jealousy entertained by some of the Viceroys, and by most of their counsellors and subordinates, of all religious authority, and shared at home by such men as the great Minister Colbert; and finally, the unjustifiable dissensions which arose among the clergy themselves.

These we can only glance at in these pages. They are fully and impartially set forth in Dr. Gosselin's biography. How far, if at all, Mgr. de Laval is to be held accountable for the bitter and protracted quarrels that arose between himself and the Governor-General, we shall see further on. Certain it is, that to him, to his apostolic zeal and generosity, are to be chiefly traced, not only the flourishing condition of religion in Canada, but the erection of the magnificent institutions on which repose religion itself and the social prosperity of the country.

III.

Let us now examine the great bishop's invincible fortitude in protecting the Indian races against the inroads of their mortal enemy—ALCOHOLISM.

The first bishop of Quebec has been severely blamed by some writers for his energetic zeal in repressing the sale of intoxicating liquors to the Indians. This, the historian and the statesman must ever hold to be one of the prelate's highest merits. Such, also, we may rest assured, will be the judgment of the Holy See, when it comes to form an estimate of the long battle of Francis de Laval with the unscrupulous traders and short-sighted economists of his day.

Samuel de Champlain, the founder of Quebec, and the governors who came after him down to 1659, had been unanimous and energetic in forbidding and punishing the sale of alcoholic stimulants to the native tribes. In this they were sustained and encouraged by the kings of France. The royal edicts forbade this criminal traffic under the severest penalties.

We refrain from reproducing here the testimonies of the most illustrious Canadian contemporaries of Mgr. de Laval on this subject. The Venerable Mary of the Incarnation, saintly and experienced Jesuit missionaries, noblemen who had exercised the vice-regal functions in Canada, all alike agree in declaring that the great bane of the native races was the mad passion for alcohol.[1]

[1] See Gosselin, i., pp. 282–285.

The traders in fur of that day knew, as well as do the conscienceless Indian agents in our western territories, that once an Indian has tasted bad brandy or bad whiskey, he becomes like a man possessed by an evil spirit. He will drink till he falls down like a log, or rages and raves about like a wild beast. It is in our days, as in those of the early Canadian colony, the poor native Indian will give everything he has in the world for a bottle of the maddening beverage. This was the weakness on which the French traders speculated. And it was from its fearful consequences that Francis de Laval and his clergy struggled to preserve the native races. Who will dare to say that their interference was not a mighty service done to God, to humanity, and to the country they sought to evangelize?

One of Bishop de Laval's contemporaries and trusted advisers in Canada, the great Jesuit missionary, Father Jerome Lalemant, thus speaks of the effects of alcoholic intoxication among the Indians about 1660:

"Satan has raised up against us a domestic foe more cruel than our public enemy; this is the mad passion of some Indians for the excessive use of liquors (*boissons*), and the criminal mania which impels some Frenchmen to sell them these liquors. The natives of America at first showed a horrible dislike for our wines; but now, when they have once had a taste of them, they become so passionately fond of them that they sell even their clothing, and their very children, in order to gratify their mad craving for drink.

"I am not willing to describe all the evils which such disorders cause in our infant Christian settlements. No ink is black enough to paint them in their true colors; one should dip one's pen in dragon's gall to convey an idea of the bitterness of soul they cause us."[1]

In 1662 the Theologians of Sorbonne, in Paris, were consulted on the moral lawfulness of thus selling wine and brandy to the Indians. "Ordinarily," it is said in the paper submitted to the Sorbonne, "the Indians only buy these liquors from Europeans for the purpose of getting drunk. Hence great disorders and great crimes. They fight and kill each other; they attack the Europeans; in short they commit a thousand and a thousand sins."[2]

On March 8, 1675, Mgr. de Laval again consulted the Sorbonne. "Ever since the establishment of the French colony in Canada," he says, "a continuous experience has demonstrated that our savages will get drunk every time they get possession of

[1] Quoted by Abbé Gosselin, i., 283.

[2] *Ibidem*, ii., p. 678.

intoxicating drinks. And if we find some Iroquois who buy French brandy and keep it to take it home to their own country, it is simply because French brandy, being distilled from wine, is much stronger, much headier, and far more intoxicating than that which they can get from New Holland, which is only made from grain. And while this (French) brandy lasts, the entire Indian village is plunged in drunkenness, committing ever species of disorder and abomination. It is a living image of hell. . . . .

"They are so inclined to get drunk, so bent on it, that they will not trade with our people for liquor, unless these have enough of it to make them all drunk. They will not buy wine or other liquors when they can get brandy, because this intoxicates them much more speedily or more powerfully. . . . .

"Drunkenness, in every place where liquor is sold to the Indians, completely ruins the Christian religion, and whatever one might hope to introduce there of civilization. . . . . Married and unmarried women drink as much as the men. Parents make their children drink. So long, therefore, as they have liquor, they live like brute beasts rather than human beings.

"Hence, they are reduced to beggary and destitution, having, most of the time, no means whatever for buying raiment or food for themselves and their children."[1]

To this fearful picture, the bishop adds the scenes of murder and bloodshed caused by intoxication among a naturally ferocious and lawless race, as well as the hideous and unnatural immorality produced by habitual intoxication.

The Venerable Mary of the Incarnation, whose labors brought her into daily and hourly contact with the Canadian Indians and their children, confirms the testimony of so many witnesses: "Our Prelate," she says, "has done everything one could think of to put a stop to this traffic, which tends to destroy the Christian faith and religion in this country. He made use of all his usual gentleness to induce Frenchmen to give up this trade in liquor, so hurtful to the glory of God and to the salvation of our savages. The French make little of his remonstrances because they are supported by the strong arm of the civil power.

"The traders tell him that the use of these liquors is a lawful one. They are told, in answer, that in a new Christian settlement, and among uncivilized races, such use should not be permitted, because experience shows that it hinders the spread of the faith, and is destructive of the pure lives to be expected from newly converted peoples. But good reasons are as of little avail as gentleness with such folk.

---

[1] *Ibidem*, ii., 679, 680, 681.

"There have been other great disputes on this subject. At length, however, zeal for the divine honor has carried away our prelate, and obliged him to excommunicate all persons concerned in this traffic. They took no account of this, saying that the Church has no authority to deal with matters of this kind."[1]

The horrible excesses produced by the unrestricted sale of wine and brandy to the Indian tribes, were one of the first crying evils with which Mgr. de Laval had to deal after his first arrival in Quebec. The royal edicts, as we have seen, forbade this criminal traffic, and the authority of the French governors had, up to 1659, been used to repress and punish it. Still, in spite of all this, the traders in furs, and others, found means to elude the vigilance of both magistrates and officers.

The new Vicar-Apostolic resolved to try the efficacy of spiritual penalties added to those imposed by the civil authority. After repeatedly consulting the Jesuit missionaries, the Sulpicians of Montreal, and the few secular priests he had on the mission, the bishop issued a pastoral letter, in which he forbade, under pain of excommunication incurred *ipso facto*, the selling of intoxicating liquors to the Indians. This was on May 5, 1660.

As the Vicar-Apostolic had only acted in all this with the unanimous advice of his clergy, so the clergy strictly enforced the prohibition, both from the pulpit and in the confessional.

This aroused a violent persecution against both clergy and bishop—a persecution which lasted long after the death of the latter. "His enemies pretended," says his early biographer, M. de Latour, "that men's consciences were oppressed; they inveighed against confessors and preachers; they assailed the moral character and conduct of these clergymen. The bishop himself was not more spared than any other."[2]

The young prelate, however, was not a person to quail before such attacks. As the numerous class of traders encouraged each other to make light of excommunications, Mgr. de Laval made an example of one of the most notorious offenders. A man, named Aigron-Lamothe having repeatedly incurred this penalty, and openly refusing to mend his life, the bishop excommunicated him by name, obliging all persons to shun him as one tainted with the foulest leprosy.

The Jesuit "Rélation," of 1660, says that the excommunication put an effective stop to drunkenness among the Indians. The civil authorities upheld the bishop at first, and caused the existing legislation against the traffic in alcohol to be rigorously enforced. In

[1] Gosselin, i., Preface, pp. xxx., xxxi. The letters of Marie de l'Incarnation were published in Paris, in 1681. They are divided into 132 *Lettres Spirituelles*, and 89 *Lettres Historiques*.

[2] *Ibidem.*

1661 two notorious offenders in this respect were condemned to death, and another was whipped publicly.

The then Governor-General, however, D'Avaugour, was a cranky old soldier, a religious man in his way, but deeply prejudiced against Mgr. de Laval, whom he believed to be ambitious and filled with the desire of making the temporal authority entirely subordinate to that of the Church.

A Frenchwoman in Quebec was convicted of selling liquor to the Indians, and put in prison by the magistrate. Father Lalemant, Superior of the Jesuits, thereupon called upon the Governor and interceded for the prisoner. "What!" said the testy old martinet, "You people are the first to denounce this selling of liquor to the Indians, and now you wont let me punish the transgressors! Be it so. But I shall not be made a fool of by your contradictions. If this woman is not to be punished for this sin, then nobody shall be punished."[1]

To be sure, the bishop, a few months before this incident occurred, had suspended for a time the enforcement of the spiritual penalties of excommunication; he had been led to believe that the evil was effectually cured.

But, as M. D'Avaugour now forbade all his subordinates to execute the laws against the sale of liquor to the Indians, the flood-gates of drunkenness were at once thrown open all over the colony. The liquor-sellers hastened to the Indian settlements, which became a chronic scene of drunken riotousness, murder, and debauchery; the catechumens whom the missionaries were instructing joined in this ungodly revelry, and gave up all thought of religion.

In spite of the zealous efforts of the Vicar-Apostolic and his clergy, the evil progressed so fearfully, that Mgr. de Laval resolved to return to France and to appeal in person to the king.

He succeeded. M. D'Avaugour was recalled. The French company to whom the colonization of Canada had been entrusted was asked to resign its charter. The crown took in hands the entire administration of the colony, and, at the request of the Vicar-Apostolic, the king promised to send a large military force to protect the French settlements from the perpetual inroads of the ferocious and victorious Iroquois.

Louis XIV. well understood the evil done to New France by the traffic in alcohol, and promised the bishop to enforce with renewed severity the royal edict forbidding it. But the Prime Minister, Colbert, was tainted with all the usual prejudices of French statesmen against the Church and her interference in sec-

[1] *Ibidem*, 297–298.

ular matters, even when these involved the welfare of religion and the dearest interests of souls.

Colbert believed, or feigned to believe, that the Church had no better reason in Canada than she had in France, or Spain, or Italy, to forbid the sale of wines or brandies. He looked upon the excommunication fulminated by Mgr. de Laval as an act of intolerable hardship to men's consciences, as well as unjustifiable interference with legitimate trade. All this, he thought, was simply an encroachment on the rights and duties of the State, which should be resisted to the utmost.[1]

The sentiments of the all-powerful Minister were well known to the officials of New France, who could thus, in winking at the sale of liquors to the savages, or even in encouraging it for their own private interest, count on the sympathy of the man who really governed France and her colonies.

The King, on recalling D'Avaugour, did Mgr. De Laval the honor of asking him to choose a Governor for Canada. The good bishop, after repeatedly declining this perilous favor, at length named M. de Mésy, who had been his own companion and friend at the Hermitage of Caen. He firmly believed that the hearty co-operation of M. de Mésy would help toward extinguishing effectually the scandal of intemperance among the Indian tribes along the St. Lawrence.

But this same De Mésy soon became the good bishop's most violent enemy. "No sooner," says M. de Latour, "had their Governor arrived than the prevailing contagion seized on him. Whether he yielded to the solicitation of others, or whether he saw in it his own interest, he secretly favored the sale of liquor, which he had been ordered and had promised to suppress."[2]

But the men who most encouraged this abominable traffic, and whose influence in Canada was most hurtful to the spiritual welfare of the native tribes, were the *Intendant*, or Royal Treasurer, Talon, and the Viceroy Frontenac. Talon was the embodiment of that French species of statecraft which, under the fair pretext of fostering the "liberties" of the Gallican Church, has ever sought to hamper and enslave Catholicism in France. He would have bishops and priests bound to obey the secular magistrate as if they were the salaried servants of the State, and as if the Church herself were the creature of the secular power.

To neutralize the authority and influence of the bishop and of the Jesuits, Talon asks the minister to recall to France some of the latter, and to send out in their stead priests "authorized beforehand to administer the sacraments . . . .; else they would be of

[1] See Abbé Gosselin, ii.

[2] Gosselin i., 353.

no use, because if they did not conform their rule of practice to that of the existing clergy, the bishop would forbid their administering the sacraments!" [1] "Men should be sent out," he continues, "who would not put any constraint on consciences, or disturb them in any way."

Talon returned to France in 1667 and came back in 1670, bringing with him six religious, who would, as he and Colbert hoped, counteract the influence of the Jesuits. They gave Mgr. de Laval trouble enough. Nothing but the prelate's prudence, charity and episcopal firmness prevented the most scandalous divisions. Their presence in the colony, at least during the administration of Mgr. de Laval, was, in the eyes of such men as Talon and Frontenac, a tacit encouragement to the liquor dealers.

In 1668, during Frontenac's first administration, the Sovereign Council of New France issued an edict freely permitting all persons to sell intoxicating liquors to the Indians, *but strictly forbidding the Indians to get drunk on the same!* The reader needs not to be told what fearful mischief was caused by this piece of insane legislation.

In 1676 the evil had reached such a pitch that the Bishop sent one of his vicars-general to France to lay his complaints before Colbert, or the King in person. M. Duchesnau, who had succeeded Talon as Royal Treasurer, strenuously supported the bishop. "Evil examples were given in high places," says Dr. Gosselin. "The magistrates themselves, and even the governors, trafficked in this liquor business or encouraged it. M. Perot, Governor of Montreal (and a nephew of Talon), used his position to enrich himself by trading in liquor. He had a trading place opened on the island now bearing his name, where he made no scruple of violating the laws of his country. He went so far that Frontenac was forced to have him arrested and sent over to France." [2]

The fact is—and it is an eloquent one—that the Royal Treasurer, Duchesnau, in a letter to Colbert of April 28, 1677, accuses the Viceroy, Frontenac himself, of selling liquor to the Indians, and of trading off furs to the English, in violation of the royal edict!

And so the worldly, hard-hearted policy of the seventeenth century statesmen prevailed over the remonstrances of the apostolic men who were evangelizing Canada.

Our bitter and humiliating experience in dealing with the savage tribes of our own vast territory, will enable all fair-minded Americans to appreciate the battle of a life-time fought by Francis

---

[1] *Ibidem.*

[2] *Ibid*, ii., 181, 182.

de Montmorency-Laval, against the sale of alcoholic liquors to the native population of New France.

IV.

The most glorious monument of the apostolic zeal and far-seeing wisdom of the first Bishop of Quebec, is the Seminary of Quebec, with its Preparatory College-School and Industrial School created at Saint Joachim by the statesmanlike forethought of this wonderful prelate.

We here in the United States have heard much in praise of that Seminary of Quebec, the fruitful parent of universities and colleges. But even the writer of these pages, though brought up from early boyhood within its walls, and ever cherishing a most grateful and most reverent memory of the place, could not, till he had read the work of Dr. Gosselin, have formed any adequate conception of the design from which it sprung. The ideal which Francis de Montmorency-Laval had before him, in founding his Seminary, is one well worthy the admiration of American Catholics.

"And here," says Dr. Gosselin, "one must not take the word *Seminary* in the narrow sense of a college, or of an ordinary classical school, or even of a house destined to train candidates for the priesthood, nor even in the broader sense of a great establishment imparting instruction of every grade, conferring university degrees, and diffusing its light all over the country. The Seminary of Quebec, as it was conceived by Mgr. de Laval, and as it issued from his hands, was all this, at least in germ and possibility; but it was more than this.

"It was an organized body embracing the entire secular clergy of the diocese, and aiming to be, as it were, the soul of the church of New France, imparting everywhere one and the same direction, the same movement, the same life, and realizing in our land the spiritual unity so ardently desired by Our Lord: 'That they may be one, as We also are.'"[1]

"In the Prelate's conception, the Seminary of Quebec was to be the great nursery of his priests, the house in which their spirit was to be moulded, cultivated, and developed. It was to be the head-quarters where he could find, at need, officers for the service of his vast diocese. It was also a house of retreat to which apostolic laborers could come to find rest after their toil, and to renew their spirit by mixing with their former masters, their friends, their fellow-soldiers. It was to be an arsenal, where should at all times be found the munitions and provisions needed by their warfare.

---

[1] St. John, xvii., ii.

"Every secular priest was to look upon the Seminary as his home. He should have the comfort, no matter how far from Quebec he labored, or how lost soever he seemed in the forests, to say to himself, as he thought of the Seminary from which he had gone forth: *Haec requies mea*;[1] there shall I find subsistence when food fails me; there shall I rest when sickness seizes me; there shall I go to die among my brethren, when I feel that the end of life hath come.

"What priests would leave old Europe, even though filled with zeal and fervor, to bury themselves in our wildernesses for years and years, enduring all sorts of privations, completely shut out from companionship with their kind, and with the prospect of having no refuge, no provision against sickness and old age? Mgr. de Laval understood that he needed a clergy trained, on the one hand, to the greatest self-sacrifice, but, on the other, made secure against the morrow, and placing their reliance on a powerful organization,—on a Seminary where priests would have all things in common, joys as well as sorrows, plenty as well as privation, merits, prayers, and sufferings."

"He conceived, therefore, a Seminary of which every secular priest should be a member:—his clergy were thus to be the seminary itself. In it men should live like true brothers, under the direction of the bishop or a superior. All private property should there be held in common, and each member of the community would put in practice the virtue of possessing nothing of his own. Every man there would be ever ready to do what should be deemed most necessary for the good of the Church, for the education of young clerics, or for the missionary ministrations.

"The Seminary would provide for the wants of all, in sickness as well as in health. It would furnish all that was necessary for public worship, for church edifices and the missions, thereby making up for the poverty of the infant colony. To the Seminary the missionaries should come back, from time to time, to renovate their souls by spiritual exercises. In illness and at the approach of death, they should ever find there a refuge, peace, and consolation."[2]

For the missionary work among the Indians, Mgr. de Laval had chosen the Jesuits. Being an old pupil of theirs, and admiring them exceedingly, he knew that he could have no reason to interfere with them in their labors, save only to support, defend, and encourage them. Their body was like a select corps in a great army, self-sufficing, with its own discipline and officers—and

---

[1] "This is my rest;" Psalm cxxxi., 14.

[2] *Vie de Mgr. de Laval*, i., pp. 361, and following.

obeying, like one man, the orders of the general-in-chief. How the Jesuits were to be recruited, or how they should subsist, were no subjects of care and anxiety for the bishop. In health or sickness, or old age, a religious order amply and tenderly provides for its members.

But how could Mgr. de Laval find for his secular clergy—for the seminary organization, which was to be composed of all of them, the material means of subsistence? He bethought him of the system of tithes in use in France. But how apply it to a poor missionary country? He decreed that tithes should be paid by all the colonial settlements to the Seminary of Quebec, inasmuch as the Seminary provided the secular clergy.

All this was submitted to the judgment of the Holy See by the Vicar Apostolic. "I have established," he writes, in 1664,[1] to Alexander VII, "in this Church of Canada, a seminary, in which are trained the young Canadian candidates for the priesthood. I have placed over it six priests who labor with zeal and success in so noble a work, and from this I hope, with the Divine blessing, abundant fruits of salvation. I have succeeded, after much toil and industry, in obtaining for this Seminary resources sufficient for its subsistence by attributing to it the revenues of the parishes, all of which I have united to the Seminary. The King has confirmed all this by his sovereign authority. . . .

"I have taken up my residence in the Seminary. There I have with me eight priests, whom I send out, as necessity demands, and at my own discretion, to attend to the various missions in my vicariate, or whom I occupy in other ecclesiastical ministrations."

As Dr. Gosselin remarks, the plan adopted for the evangelization of a new and vast country, and the means chosen for providing for the subsistence of a missionary clergy during the first phase of a colony so far removed from the mother country, were singularly akin to the organization formed in Germany by the Venerable Holzhauser among the secular clergy of the seventeenth century. This admirable association, so highly praised by Innocent XI., resembled the Apostolic Union of M. Victor le Beurrier, which has been honored by the warm approbation of Leo XIII., and by him recommended to all secular priests. The many devoted clergymen throughout the United States, and around us here in New York, who live in conformity with the blessed rules of this Union, will appreciate the God-inspired work of Francis de Montmorency-Laval in founding the Seminary of Quebec.

---

[2] *Informatio de Statu Ecclesia*, quoted by Gosselin, i., 373.

Two priests, who "alternately governed the Seminary of Quebec for more than half a century," stand forth by the side of its saintly founder, forming a trio of men as illustrious as can be claimed in its beginning by any church in America. These are M. Henri de Bernieres, and M. Ango de Maizerets. They, like the Vicar Apostolic himself, were inspired, impelled, animated by the twofold nobility of high birth and holiness of life. Another name from among those of this first glorious generation of the Canadian clergy must also be mentioned with these parents of the Church in New France; that is, the name of John Dudouyt. The memory of his priceless services can never die.

These and their companions lived with the bishop in a little house which the latter had purchased, and which stood on the site of what is now the rectory of the Metropolitan Church. There were laid, in poverty and absolute self-denial and self-sacrifice, the foundations of that grand and unique moral edifice, the Seminary of Quebec.

It was in 1663. "Nothing," M. de Latour tells us, "more eloquently sets forth the primitive Christian Church than this little flock of priests. Patrimonial property, simple ecclesiastical benefices, government pensions, presents or honorary stipends bestowed on them—everything was held in common."[1]

"Our property was put in common with that of the bishop," says M. de Maizerets. "I never saw any distinction made among us of the rich man from the poor, nor any reference made to birth or personal rank; we regarded each other as brothers."[2]

And Dr. Gosselin remarks that this admirable union of souls among all the members of the Canadian clergy so struck the second Bishop of Quebec, Mgr. de Saint-Valier, on his arrival in Quebec, that he forthwith wrote to France: "All the clergymen here, the canons, the rector of the parish, and the seminary, only form a single household, the holiness of which has won universal respect."[3]

It is to be observed, however, that the Bishop allowed his priests the most perfect liberty in this regard. "He contented himself with exhorting them to enter into *the inheritance of the child Jesus* (as he termed it), and with pointing out to them all the spiritual and temporal advantages they were to derive from so doing. One was obliged to solicit again and again the favor of being admitted, and to promise fidelity in fulfilling the requisite conditions—namely, the accounting to the Superior for all one's income, whether fixed or casual, and

[1] Quoted by Gosselin, i., 382. [2] *Ibidem.* [3] *Ibidem*, 383.

the not giving up a benefice without the consent of the Seminary."[1]

A characteristic of Mgr. de Laval was his ardent piety for our Incarnate Lord in His hidden life at Nazareth. The thirty years passed by Him in obscurity and dutiful obedience to Mary and Joseph were a preparation for His public mission. The infancy, boyhood and early manhood of our Great High Priest and Redeemer are the model on which our sacerdotal youth are to be trained and formed. The first Bishop of Quebec would have the men who educated his young Levites in a missionary country, and in a new world, practice all the virtues which shone in the parents of Jesus at Nazareth. The inheritance of the Divine Babe reared by Mary and Joseph was surpassingly rich in the eternal promises. The supernatural spirit of self-denial and self-sacrifice, which was that of the Holy Family, was most needful in a seminary like that created by Mgr. de Laval, and among a clergy whose life, for many generations to come, must be one of apostolic poverty and suffering.

There was, therefore, a singular appropriateness in his placing his Seminary under the patronage of the Holy Family of Nazareth, and his preparatory College School, when founded later on, under that of the Child Jesus. They were consistent with themselves and their professions, these parents, under God, of religion in Canada.

The building of the material edifice which was to be both the Theological Seminary and the home of the secular clergy, was begun early in 1666. The pupils went daily across the adjoining square to the Jesuit College (founded in 1632) where they followed the courses in secular and sacred knowledge given by these accomplished masters.

The establishment of the *Petit Seminaire* or Preparatory School, dates from 1668, when Louis XIV. and his Minister, Colbert, pressed Mgr. de Laval to adopt a regular plan for educating the Indian children of both sexes "in accordance with French customs." These children were to dress after the French fashion, to speak the French language, and adopt French manners. The Ursulines received a number of girls, and had some beginning of success with them. The good bishop, who was under great personal obligations to the King, wished very much to gratify him. On October 9, 1668 the *Petit Seminaire de l' Enfant Jesus* was solemnly inaugurated by the side of the Seminary proper. There were eight French boys, with six Huron lads on whom the first "Frenchifying" experiment was to be attempted.

---

[1] *Ibid.*

The attempt failed most signally for both boys and girls. The bishop, from the beginning, foresaw and foretold it. The boys made off to the woods after a brief period of confinement and discipline, which to them was most intolerable hardship. As to the girls, the Venerable Marie de l' Incarnation writes: "Of a hundred of them who have passed through our hands, we have scarcely civilized one. We find in them a certain degree of mental docility; but, just at the moment we least suspect it, they climb over our fences and go off to the woods with their parents, where they find much more pleasure than in any of our French houses."[1]

The Jesuits also made the experiment on some young Algonquins, and with a like result.

The *Petit Seminaire* thus founded, continued to prosper in spite of the desertion and withdrawal of the Indian pupils. The bishop watched over the twin Seminaries as over the apple of his eye. He purchased, between the Church of Notre Dame and the cliff overhanging the lower town, some sixteen acres of land, and on that part of it nearest to the Church soon arose, to the astonishment of the colonists, a spacious and imposing stone structure, which was opened to his college-boys on December 8th, 1677.

Down to 1730 the pupils of the Petit Seminaire or College received from the Seminary of Quebec free board, lodging, clothing, and school furniture. All this the bishop found means to provide for them, as he did for the Theological Seminary,—by what might well be regarded as a continuous miracle of Providence. Since 1730, parents have had to provide raiment and books. The Seminary inheriting the property of its generous founder, dispensed with a like generous hand the revenues the property afforded.

There arose, in course of time, for the accommodation of the theologians, professors, and of the secular priests in general, similar spacious and solid structures in stone. God was the bishop's treasurer, and He never failed to reward His servant's childlike faith in the divine liberality. Meanwhile the self-sacrificing prelate purchased from the crown or from individuals other property in the city and neighborhood, as well as the *Seigneuries* or lordships on land, which to this day support the Seminary of Quebec and its dependent offspring the *Petit Seminaire*, and the Laval University with all its schools of theology, law, and medicine. The priests who devote themselves to the work of education in Seminary, College, and University, still live like those who shared with the first Bishop of Quebec his life of unceasing and manifold toil, of voluntary poverty and heroic devotion to duty

[1] Gosselin, i., 562.

The spirit of unfaltering and joyous self-sacrifice which animated the descendant of the Montmorency and his associates, lives to this day among their latest successors. The writer of these lines was brought up,—a blessing for which he can never be sufficiently grateful—beneath the eyes of directors and masters who continued, in their own persons and conduct, all the priestly virtues and scholarly accomplishments, which surrounded Mgr. de Laval as with a triple halo. The venerable and loved figures of Jerome Demers, Antoine Parant, Louis and Leon Gingras, John Holmes, and,—last and greatest—Louis Jacques Casault, are unforgotten among the present brilliant generation of masters and pupils in the great schools of Quebec and Montreal. Cardinal Taschereau, who has been M. Casault's most efficient helpmate in creating the University, is the golden link in the chain which connects the present order of things in the seminary with its glorious past. He comes up before our mind's eye now as we first beheld him in 1832, when, doubly orphaned and a stranger, God's good providence brought us by the hand to Mgr. de Laval's *Petit Seminaire*. Who among the college generations of that day in Quebec, did not admire in Alexander Taschereau the varied and superior talents, the quiet and reserved disposition, and the studious habits, which promised so much and have, in the splendid reality, gone so far beyond their promise? He is only the natural fruit of the blessed tree planted by the saintly Bishop of Petra more than two centuries ago, the most honored son of that great mother of statesmen and churchmen, *the Seminary*.

We have mentioned the agricultural and industrial school established at Saint Joachim by Mgr. de Laval. We of the nineteenth century here in the United States must admire the practical and broad-minded spirit of the great bishop.

"Whenever," says Dr. Gosselin, "the Directors of the Seminary became assured that any one of their pupils was not called to be a priest, they immediately, with the consent of his parents, set such a pupil to learn farming, or some trade like that of a mason, a shoemaker, a tailor, wood carver, or carpenter, etc. For that purpose they sent him to the Model Farm, at Saint Joachim, situated at the foot of *Cap Tourmente*, the Cape of Storms.

"In this delightful spot Mgr. de Laval, whose far-seeing mind took in all the needs of the society around him, had established a sort of third Seminary, called also the Great Farm, where the sons of the peasant-folk were taught reading, writing, arithmetic, as well as all the mechanical trades, agriculture especially. The zealous prelate well knew the influence, in a new country, of heads of families reared in the practice of piety and possessing a certain education.

"The pupils' time, every day, was divided between religious exercises, short hours of study, field labor, or work at the different trades most needed in the colony.

"The 'Great Farm' thus became a nursery of excellent farmers and artizans, devotedly attached to the Seminary. From it went forth house servants, agriculturists, colonists who were chosen to develop the possessions of the Seminary itself. Many of the pupils so distinguished themselves that they were frequently employed as arbiters or referees by the Sovereign Council."[1]

Before the death of Mgr. de Laval, the director under him of the Saint Joachim Farm and School raised the level of literary studies there, so as to enable him to train schoolmasters for the new parishes which were then springing up on every side. This was, if we mistake not, the first attempt at establishing a normal school in what is now English-speaking America.

V.

It was, as we have stated above, the blessed privilege of Mgr. de Laval to be surrounded in Canada, from his first arrival there, by men and women who were as earnest as himself in running the race of sanctity. We have mentioned the names of a few only of the priests of his seminary who strove to be in all things the worthy followers of such a model and master.

The Jesuits who, in that day, gave their labors and their lives to the twofold apostleship of education and the missions, have left names behind, which American Catholics in the twentieth century may see surrounded with the authorized halo of sanctity. Their existence was a continuous martyrdom.

And then we have among the religious communities of women the venerable and venerated names of Marie de l'Incarnation, Catherine de St. Augustin, Marguerite Bourgeois, and the saintly Indian maiden, Catherine Tehgakonita, the odor of whose supernatural virtues filled the New France of the seventeenth century.

In the sublime paths in which all these heroic souls trod, Francis de Laval was their guide. No height of holiness was reached by them which he had not scaled before them. The biography of Dr. Gosselin opens up to the reader such a rich record of glorious, spiritual performance as must edify and enchant all who believed our early North American Church to be barren in consummate sanctity.

But how surpassingly touching and beautiful is the narrative of the closing years of Mgr. de Laval's career of mingled laborious-

[1] Vol. i., 567.

ness and suffering. When, in 1706, the seminary which he had almost completely rebuilt after its first destruction by fire in 1701, was again burned to the ground, the venerable octogenarian was prostrated by illness. They carried him helpless from amid the flames to the college of the Jesuits across the Cathedral Square. His unconquerable spirit rose above this second crushing calamity. The seminary, like all else that he had created, he knew to be the work of God, and he trusted firmly and wholly in God's good providence to restore it. The priests around him were disheartened. No help was to be looked for in France, where the long and terrible war of succession had shorn the king of his prestige and utterly ruined the financial condition of the kingdom. Bishop de Saint Valier was still a prisoner in England. It was deemed necessary to close the schools and send the pupils back to their families. But Mgr. de Laval would not hear of it. The schools were kept open. Rising superior to all these calamities and to his own bodily ills, the aged prelate set about rebuilding once more. It had ever been his cherished custom to be present at all the solemn services in the cathedral. He now deemed it more than ever needful that he should be seen in his place in public and among his stricken flock. He caused himself to be carried or helped into the sanctuary at morning or afternoon service. And the loved voice of the man of God was there raised to inspire the people with the undying hope and trust in God which filled his own heart.

And they heard and treasured up his words and acted on them. The seminary rose again from its ruins.

No ordination was omitted; when he could not perform this solemn function in the cathedral, he did so in the little private oratory adjoining his own poor room. So was it with confirmation. This bright light of the Canadian Church only shone with more surpassing splendors amid the general gloom, and as the shadows gathered and darkened around his own pathway.

The winter of 1708, which was that of his own episcopal jubilee, was one of unheard of rigor in Quebec. The cold was terrific. No one then, however, had thought of heating the churches. The canons of the Quebec cathedral and their people never interrupted for a single day their most edifying custom of singing the morning and evening services. Lent and Holy Week came and the intense cold still held on. On Palm Sunday the venerable bishop persisted in remaining in church all through the long offices. His feet were much swollen; and the good Brother Houssard, his valet, threatened to ask the Superior of the seminary to interfere and advise the Bishop to remain away from church. He gave himself some rest until Holy Thursday, when the consecration of the Holy Oils must needs take place. Then, on

Good Friday, neither fatigue nor the intolerable cold could induce the man of God to stay away from the cathedral. His feet were frozen, one of his heels so badly that to relieve the inflammation which at once set in the surgeons cut open the gangrened part. Nothing could stop the progress of the evil. The sufferings of the heroic patient were most fearful from that moment till death relieved him.

"My God, my good God," he would cry out in his agony, "spare me! Take pity on me! . . . . Yet not my will, but Thine be done!" And so night and day the long agony went on, while all who beheld the sufferer or heard the cries wrung from him by the extremity of pain could not withhold their tears.

The vital parts were at last attacked and the exhausted and numbed organs refused even the strength to cry out. Some of the beloved disciples and companions who surrounded the poor pallet of the dying apostle, pressed him to follow the example of the saintly men of old and address a farewell instruction to his dear ones. "Ah, they were saints," he replied, "and I am but a sinner."

He received the last sacraments with the most edifying fervor. He then caused the assistants to recite with him the Rosary of the Holy Family, a devotion which he had himself taught his people, and his gentle spirit passed away as the priest was repeating, in the concluding prayer, the words: *Ut a Te secundum cor Tuum inveniri mereamur;* "(Grant) that we be then found by Thee to be after Thine own heart." Surely we may well believe that the Master and Judge found him so.

It was the 6th of May, 1708, and half-past six o'clock in the morning.

The aim of his life had been to make of Canada one great Christian family from which should be excluded the vices, the discords and the elements of moral and social decay prevalent in the Europe of his time. More even than Count de Frontenac had merited the name of Saviour of Canada, did Francis de Montmorency Laval deserve to be called its Parent as well as its Apostle. The entire colony, in its length and breadth, mourned as for the death of a father.

During three days and nights the remains of the dead prelate lay in state in the cathedral. Night and day the multitude thronged to gaze upon the face they knew so well, to kiss the hands which had loaded them with blessings, which had given to the poor, literally, every object of any value, that remained in his cell-like apartment, and to bedew with their tears of grateful love the feet which had so often and so unweariedly borne to them, over river and lake and forest, the Peace, the Light which is God. Then

the cloistered communities, Ursulines and Hotel Dieu, besought the Vicars-General to have the remains of their beloved Father and benefactor carried in succession to their churches, so that they might look on his face once more. So to all the communities of both men and women he whom every voice now called *Saint* was carried in solemn procession. It was an extraordinary and moving spectacle. Then they laid the humble prelate to rest in the vaults of the cathedral. He would have no tablet placed to designate the spot where he was to be buried. Only, long before his death, he had solemnly stipulated that, wherever he chanced to die, his heart should be taken to his beloved seminary, and there be finally placed in the seminary chapel when this should be built.

In 1878 an accident led to the discovery of the casket containing all that was mortal of the Apostle of Canada. This time it was resolved to give effect to his oft-expressed wish to rest in death within the seminary, among the men who were heirs to all that he possessed in life, to his apostolic zeal and virtues. The bishops, the clergy, the people of all Canada, met in Quebec for this solemn translation. It was a spectacle such as the New World had never till then beheld. Again Francis de Montmorency Laval's remains were borne through the streets of the city, visiting in succession churches and religious communities. And again the popular soul was stirred, as at the time of his death and burial, to proclaim its firm belief in his sanctity. Thus twice most solemnly canonized by the people who had lived with him and worshipped him, and by the generation which had inherited their holiest convictions, Mgr. de Laval has been proclaimed Venerable by the Holy See. It is only the first step toward the final and infallible judgment of the Church in the cause of one, who deserves to be revered as the St. Charles Borromeo of America.

EARLY CHRISTIAN SEPULTURE.

IT is remarkable and it serves to illustrate the strength and universality of the original tradition of the immortality of the soul, of the continued existence of the *To Ego* in another world, and of the resurrection of the body; the *Non omnis moriar:* "I shall not wholly die," of the Roman laureate; that so much thought and care have at all times and among all people been given to prepare, in life, a resting-place after death. Some of the most beautiful productions, whether of heathen or of Christian poets, from the *Archytas* of Horace to the *Lycidas* of Milton, are founded upon the added misfortune after death of unburied mortal remains, from Gray's *Ode* on the Bards massacred by King Edward I., when he conquered Wales, to where

> "Burgundy bequeathed his tombless host,
> A bony heap, through ages to remain
> Themselves their monument; the Stygian coast
> Unsepulchred they roamed, and shrieked each wandering ghost."
>
> *Byron.*

The early Christians always paid great attention to the decent interment of their brethren; and even in times of pestilence and of persecution this charitable office was faithfully performed. Indeed, their treatment of those who had gone before "with the sign of faith and rest in the sleep of peace," was one of the most salient points of contrast between them and their opponents. This is so true that Julian the apostate enumerates this pious solicitude for the burial of the dead, whether rich or poor, whether free or slave, as one of the chief means by which the Christian religion had become paramount in the empire.

The Roman Martyrology, on the 8th of December, commemorates the fact that Pope Saint Eutichian buried in different places, two hundred and forty-two martyrs with his own hands; and early documents tell us that the faithful of Lyons and of Vienna felt acutely and openly lamented their inability, on account of the severity of the then raging persecution, to give a religious resting-place to the bodies of all who perished in those parts of Gaul. A Christian named Nicander is also mentioned in the Martyrology, on the 15th of March, as having suffered martyrdom in Egypt for collecting the relics of the saints in order to give an honorable sepulture to their remains. The Church historian, Eusebius, has recorded the Tobias-like example of Saint Dionysius, of Alexan-

dria, during a malignant plague which was ravaging lower Egypt, to show how, under such conditions, the charitable care of Christians extended itself to the labor of burying the dead as a corporal work of mercy. The ancient Greeks, who were the most cultivated people of the West, followed a universal practice—so different from the customs of the East—of incinerating the dead. This usage passed toward the decline of the Republic along with Greek philosophy and letters into favor with the wealthier Romans, and suddenly became so common that nothing was left of statesman or hero after death but, in the words of a mournful poet:

"Two handfuls of white dust, shut in an urn of brass!"

Both the traditions of the East and the example of our divine Lord moved the early Christians to revolt against such a usage, although it was perfectly well understood that no variation in the mode of disposing of the body after death could affect its resurrection. Cremation, however, was objected to as harmonizing less with a humble submission to the primeval curse contained in Genesis: "In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread, till thou return to the earth out of which thou was taken;" and as at least *suggesting* a denial of that truth which was so precious to those who without it would have been, as St. Paul teaches, "most miserable of all men." The conservative spirit which has always characterized the Church, and it is interesting to remember this in our age, when it is attempted to revive and to popularize cremation, was never better expressed than by one of her noblest apologists, Minucius Felix, in the second century: "Nor, as you may believe, do we fear for the resurrection, no matter how our bodies are disposed of; nevertheless, we follow the original and the better custom of burial in the ground" (*Octavius*, 34). This abhorrence of the Christians was so universal and so well known that it was common for their persecutors to insult their remains and outrage the feelings of their surviving brethren by burning their bodies after martyrdom. It is therefore certain that the early Christians always professed respect for these bodies which, when alive, had been the temples of the Holy Ghost, and that, whenever practicable, they assured them decent burial after death. Thus we read of St. Torpes, martyr, that, as he was being led to execution, he managed, having been an officer of the imperial household, to be allowed to pass before the dwelling of a friend, named Andronicus, in order to speak to him privately, and begged him to see that his body received proper burial, and told him that God would surely reward him for the kindness. St. Victor, another martyr, and his wife, St. Corona, asked the Roman magistrate, before they died, to permit their

remains to be buried in the place which, according to custom with people of their condition, they had long since provided for themselves. St. Eustratius, martyr, at Sebaste, in Asia Minor, made a will before dying in which he directed that his body should be brought back to his native country—the ancients were very expert at embalming and Tertullian mentions the practice as common among the more opulent Christians—and even requested the Bishop of Sebaste to accompany it in person. St. Fortunatus, martyr, in Egypt, gave twenty pieces of gold to the executioner before being beheaded, as a bribe not to burn his body, but to give it up to his friends who would bury it in the earth decently. St. Sabinus, martyr, likewise in Egypt, who was condemned to be cast into a river with a great stone attached to him to make him sink, recommended to his weeping brethren to try to recover his body and to bury it *along with the stone*. These examples, drawn from different and far-distant parts of the Roman world, show us how universal this sentiment of religious sepulture was among the early Christians.

Almost all ancient writers of the Church describe one or more of the rites of Christian burial; and thus, by comparing and collating these scattered passages, we can gather a sufficiently accurate knowledge of what these were. To begin with, the body was always, when possible, laid out in a distinctive and funeral dress, so that by the outward vesture, which was new and rich according to the means of the deceased, a change was suggested, as if to express symbolically the idea of St. Paul to the Corinthians: "This corruption must put on incorruption, and this mortal put on immortality." Eusebius has recorded in his "Life of Constantine" (iv., 66) that the Emperor was buried in a purple robe, and with a crown of gold upon his head. The body of the martyr Marinus was clothed in a beautiful white tunic, and was laid to rest with great pomp, in evident allusion to the text of the Apocalypse: "He that shall overcome, shall thus be clothed in white garments." Very often the bodies of Christians were buried in white linen winding-sheets, as was observed by the Egyptians and the Hebrews; but with this superadded idea attached both to the color and to the material,—for the lives of the early Christians were saturated with symbolism,—that the *color* typified the innocence of the soul, whose body alone could expect to rise to *glory*, and the *material*, the patiently borne tribulations of this life, those particularly which were inflicted "for justice's sake," because, as an old mystical author observes, linen is not produced except the flax or hemp be previously subjected to a severe process of pulling and tearing. For, as the Apostle tells his disciple, Timothy, "All who will live piously in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution"

(II. Tim., iii., 12). Sometimes the body, after it had been properly prepared, was exposed to public view, or, as we would now say, it lay in state. Thus, St. Peter of Alexandria, bishop of that patriarchal see, and martyr, was vested after death in all his pontifical robes, and seated, just as though still living, upon the chair of Mark the Evangelist, founder of that Church. During the fourth and fifth centuries there was often so much ostentation displayed in dressing out the bodies of the faithful in their robes of state, insignia of rank and other vanities, that Saints Basil and John Chrysostom raised their eloquent voices against such an abuse. The precious stuffs and ornaments used upon them, in these cases, gave occasion, it was objected, to thieves and robbers to violate the tombs and profane the bodies of the dead, in order to possess themselves of the treasures buried there.

Before the dead were removed from their homes, prayers and psalmody were recited, while lighted lamps hung suspended around the bodies, not altogether nor primarily to dispel the possible darkness, but to typify faith in Him who is the true Light of this World. The number of lights lit on these occasions were at an early period limited or extended—with a symbolical sense—according to the state of life or the offices filled by the deceased. For instance, around the catafalque erected in St. Peter's for the Pope's body, "A thousand candles of yellow wax and twenty enormous torches in golden candelabra burn day and night," during nine days, as if to figure that a thousand dioceses, all the episcopal sees of the world, mourn their chief pastor, and that twenty, in particular, are the dread articles of scrutiny to be flashed from the splendor of the divine countenance on him who, as Vicar of Christ, "hath set his tabernacle in the sun" (Ps. xviii., 6). St. Augustine, describing the death of his mother, St. Monica, at Ostia, says, in his "Confessions" (lib. 9): "Evodius opened the psalter, and began to intone a psalm, to whom we all responded, choir-like, in alternate verses." The custom of ringing a bell while a person was dying or immediately after death, or while the body was being transported to its burial-place, is a pious ancient custom. It is called in old English sometimes the knell and sometimes the passing-bell. In Rome and other towns of Italy this bell is tolled with strict attention, denoting by the number and kind of strokes the sex, the age and the condition of the person. The original purpose of this custom was to acquaint the faithful with the death of one of their brethren, and implore prayers for his soul. The custom of distinguishing the quality of the deceased by a peculiar way of tolling the passing-bell, was already established in the thirteenth century. How strong was the faith in purgatory, and how pious in old Catholic times people were toward

the dead, is shown in many ways. At Rome, for centuries the great bell of St. Mary Major rings out one hour after sundown for prayers for the dead. It is called the *Ave Maria de Morti*, or Angelus of the Dead. In many cities of France, as late as the last century, it was customary for a man dressed in a white garment, on which tears, death's-heads and cross-bones were embroidered, to go walking slowly through the streets, after nightfall, ringing a hand-bell and calling out in a sing-song tone:

"Reveillez vous, gens qui dormez,
Priez Dieu pour les trépassés."

During the first three centuries of the Church, which were years of almost continual persecution, naturally there could not be much, if anything, of funeral pomp among the Christians, because the bodies of the dead were hurried off to the subterranean cemeteries, called catacombs, as soon and as privately as possible; although *there* the last rites of religion were generally performed, because in the privacy and often absolute secrecy (to outsiders) of these places, there was little danger of molestation. As soon, however, as peace had been given to the Church, under Constantine the Great, obsequies were performed with a certain settled order; and there were ministers in the Church bearing different names at different periods, *Parabolani*, *Lecticarii*, *Fossores*, *Decani*, who were officially charged with the burial of the plague-stricken and the poor. The attendance of the clergy at funerals must have begun at an early period, for St. Gregory of Nyssa (372–395) has recorded the presence of deacons and priests at the holy death and burial of his sister, Macrina, surnamed the Younger, whose life he wrote. His words are: "The crowd of people around her bier was so great and so eager to behold such a touching and extraordinary spectacle, that it was not easy to make a passage for us. On either side there walked no small number of deacons and ministers who all kept a certain order in the procession and carried lighted torches in their hands." During this carrying of the body psalms were sung, and at the place of sepulture other ecclesiastical offices were performed and, especially, the Holy Sacrifice was offered for the dead. If there had been something eminent in the deceased either by reason of his virtue or his rank and station, whether in the Church or the State, a funeral oration was generally pronounced over the body before its final putting away, and several such discourses have been preserved among the writings of the Fathers. Thus Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea, in Palestine, pronounced one over his friend and patron, the Emperor Constantine; St. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, over the Emperors Theodosius and Valentinian and over his own brother, Satyr. The sermon preached over the

body of Satyr was followed up, seven days after, by another upon the hope of a future life, which is a very early testimony to the existence of that with which we are all acquainted, the prayer in the missal and the rite of absolution in the ritual, on the seventh day after burial. Sts. John Chrysostom and Jerome mention the custom approvingly of giving alms at funerals for the relief of the souls of the dead. It was from such a custom that originated those old foundations, called in England bead-houses, in which the inmates known as beads-men or beads-women, prayed daily for the souls of benefactors; and also of the pious practices, still maintained in a few of the ancient Catholic families in Great Britain, of distributing to all comers, on the day of the funeral, a *Dole* (as it is properly called) of loaves or coin or both, in number equal to the years of the deceased. For a most interesting chapter on this whole subject among the Anglo-Saxons and early Normans in England, we would refer to the third volume of the learned Dr. Rock's "Church of Our Fathers." Anniversaries of the dead were religiously kept in very ancient times, with distribution of alms, decoration of the grave, a funeral banquet and, or rather before everything, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass offered up for the soul of the deceased. The custom of spreading flowers over the graves or of hanging garlands at the tombs of the faithful departed was very ancient among Christians and is mentioned without reproof by St. Jerome and St. Ambrose. In French these garlands are called *immortelles*, and are neither more nor less than the legitimate modern expression of a custom at least sixteen hundred years old, and a silent profession of faith in the immortality of the soul and of hope in the resurrection of the body to enjoy the delights of Paradise, which was symbolized by flowers set in a garden. In ages of persecution, it was customary to bury with martyrs a little bottle or phial containing some of their blood or some instrument of their torture. With ordinary Christians, medals, crosses, copies of the Gospels were interred; and the tombs of children have been many times found to contain their playthings. In the fifth century, the Sacred Host was sometimes laid on the breasts of bishops and interred with them. Simple priests and monks received only an unction of chrism on their breasts. But this custom was forbidden by the Council of Auxerre, in France, in the next century. Yet, notwithstanding the repeated prohibitions of councils, the Sacred Host used to be left in the tomb with the body of one who had not been able, through no fault of his own, to receive the Viaticum before his death. This abuse was not entirely eradicated before the eighth century. In the thirteenth century it was customary to deposit a little cup of holy water in the coffin of the deceased and to burn incense around it, which is the origin of the comparatively

modern rite of sprinkling and incensing the grave when the funeral reaches the cemetery. But the custom of sprinkling and incensing the body dates from many centuries earlier as we know from ancient writings, and as may be seen in the ancient frescoes in St. Clement's basilica at Rome, which were discovered a few years ago. We learn from the work of Durandus, Bishop of Mende, in the thirteenth century, that it was customary to make three halts or stoppages in carrying the body from the house to the church or to the place of interment, and to give what are called "the absolutions" over the body. The origin of this rite is said by Decorde to be found in the merciful loosening from censures and excommunication which was accorded to those who, being bound by them, had not been able, although giving signs of repentance, to receive before death the canonical absolution itself. The beautiful prayer, response or dirge, called the *Libera*, which is a portion of this part of the Office for the Dead, was composed in the twelfth century by Maurice de Sully, Bishop of Paris, and was quickly adopted by Rome with some slight verbal modifications to make it conform more closely to the words of Scripture.

The early Christians in Rome, at least, and in the cities of the West subject to Roman municipal law (the people of the West, we may remark, being mostly barbarians, without a written code of laws, were consequently compelled to receive the Roman jurisprudence, whereas in the East, which was highly civilized, the Roman conquest made few changes in manners and customs), did not bury their dead within the city walls, agreeably to the tenth law of the Twelve Tables, which says: "Neither burn nor bury a dead body within the city." But they always carefully avoided the necessity of interring their dead with the heathen dead; and a curious as well as most ancient inscription, given by the learned Muratori in his great collection, illustrates this intense desire to rest after this life in the company of our brethren in the faith, nor have our mortal remains mingle with those of pagans. This inscription, which was discovered at Florence by Muratori, shows us a certain Jucundus, who, having become a Christian, sells to another man his right of sepulture, literally his right to jars,—*jus ollarum*,—to understand which it must be remembered that in ancient Rome, while the lower sort of slaves were promiscuously thrown into deep pits dug on the Esquiline hill, and the free-born classes were buried in separate family tombs entirely above ground, the better sort of slaves, and a middle class called freedmen,—*libertini*,—because emancipated from slavery, almost always united together in voluntary communities as one large family, and erected an immense burying-place, something like a great square shaft of brick or masonry, plastered on the inside, and covered with scroll-paint-

ing, sunk deep into the ground, with innumerable holes cut into the sides at equal distances all around, above and below each other, and into these niches were set sometimes plain, round, earthenware jars, sometimes highly ornamented marble or stone receptacles, each with a cover; the cover on those of the more durable material resembling a roof, as the rest resembled the front of a house. These receptacles contained the ashes of the dead whose bodies had been cremated according to the universal custom in later Rome. Inscriptions giving the name, employment during life, and other notices of the deceased, are written or engraved on the receptacles themselves, or on the available space of the walls. From the pigeon-hole-like appearance of these little mural openings,—the jar or miniature house seeming like a nest,—and the general resemblance to a dove-cot, these sort of burial-places were called *columbaria*. It might be asked, in view of the fact that in this inscription cinerary urns are mentioned,—note the plural,—what could the owner have wanted with more than one urn for his own ashes? The answer is, that a freedman who was head of a family used to possess sometimes several or a large number, a whole row or section, of these jars or urns in the same columbarium, for himself, his wife and his children. The beginning and important part of the inscription is as follows: *Faustus. Antoniæ. Drusi. Jus. Emit. Jucundi. Christiam. Oll.;* that is, "Faustus, the slave (or perhaps the freedman) of Antonia, wife of Drusus, bought of Jucundus, the Christian, his right of urns." Let us take note, at once, of the great antiquity of this commercial transaction which brings us back—as we judge with absolute certainty from the noble names of Antonia and of Drusus, to the reign of the Emperor Claudius, if not even a little earlier, and which would fix it near the year 45, or during the Apostolic preaching of St. Peter in Rome. We think, too, with the erudite French antiquary, Abbe Martigny, that it is probably the earliest mention yet brought to light of the name of "Christian" upon a mortuary inscription. Not only do we find the burial-places of the ancient Romans all extra-mural, but every other city of the Peninsula had its necropolis or its isolated tombs in the same condition. The Jews and the Greeks also buried their dead outside of the towns. The places of early Christian sepulture were called by different names in different ages, the most general and generic one being cemetery, from the Greek *koimeteria*, dormitories or sleeping-places. Among the Cretans, the wayside unfurnished establishments or station-houses, built and maintained by public authority for the accommodation of travellers to pass the night in, like the Khans in the East, were called cemeteries. The Christians, as we learn explicitly from St. Denis of Alexandria, who died in the year 265, did not call death by the Greek word, but by one

meaning slumber or sleep. In Christian Latin inscriptions of even a much earlier date, the dead were said to sleep, or some other expression was used which deprived death of part of its terrors in the hope of an awakening; thus the frequent terms *dormire, requiescere, deponi.* The expression of sleep used for death was taken by the Christians from the Sacred Writings, where it occurs both in the Old and the New Testament. There were two distinct kinds of places of sepulture among the early Christians, those underground and called *Catacombs*,—which were not at all confined to Rome, although the name originated at Rome,—and those above ground and in the open air, called by the classical names of *Monumentum, Memoria, Cella, Hypogeum, Area*, etc. The subterranean cemeteries were excavated by the early Christians for the express purpose of burying their dead in safety and together. The custom of burying here, lasted for a considerable period after any necessity of doing so existed. It was then done out of pure devotion. From St. Augustine's "Treatise on the Care of the Dead," and from many inscriptions found in Italy, France and elsewhere, it is known that the faithful desired to have their last resting-places beside or at least near the tombs of martyrs and confessors in hope of a powerful intercession, whence such common forms, especially in the fourth century, as *Positus ad martyres, Ad sanctos.*

In an epigram written by St. Gregory of Nazianzen, on the death of his mother, we read that she was buried beside the bodies of martyrs, and a direct appeal is made to them by this holy Doctor to extend their protection over her. Sometimes, however, this honor of posthumous association was refused through a sentiment of profound humility, as when Pope St. Damasus says of himself, in the metrical inscription which he set up in the venerable papal crypt in the catacomb of St. Calixtus: "I, Damasus, acknowledge that I wished to lay my bones here, but I feared to disturb the sacred dust of the saints." This was in the third quarter of the fourth century. We ought not to allow these underground cemeteries, although so interesting in themselves and so replete with information, expressed symbolically or in so many terms about the faith and discipline of the primitive Church, to monopolize our interest in early Christian sepulture; for the burial-places built by noble and wealthy Christians above ground and, outwardly at least, in precisely the same circumstances as those of their heathen fellow-subjects, are also noteworthy for their inscriptions, which throw a flood of light on the manners and customs of the period, and especially on the long misunderstood and only recently begun-to-be-studied relations of the Christian community towards the State during the age of persecutions. There were many localities where the nature of the soil did not permit of excavating under-

ground cemeteries or catacombs, and others where local tradition has perpetuated the continual absence, for some reason or another, of such a mode of burial. That this must have been the case at Carthage (in Africa) at an early period, is clear from the testimony of Tertullian that in the year 203 the rioting populace demanded the overturning of the Christian burial-places, and St. Cyprian, bishop of the city, and martyr, was buried, in the year 258, in the *Area* or overground family tomb of the procurator, Macrobius Candidus. Ruinart tells us in his "Genuine Acts of the Martyrs" that in the next year other martyrs were buried in an *area*, the name or the owner of which is not given. Let us here remark—as illustrating the charitable feelings of the early Christians toward one another without regard to accidents of birth or fortune, and as being in accord with the sublime sentiment expressed by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians (III., 27, 28): "For as many of you as have been baptized in Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek; *there is neither bond nor free*"—that although many slaves and many freedmen were members of the Church in the very earliest ages, yet it is extremely rare to find in Christian burial-places the least allusion to, or the slightest indication of, their servile origin. And again, as manifesting from the very earliest period the equalizing tendencies of the Church, we would go further and say of those purer ages,—purer, not in doctrine, which is unchangeable and irreformable, but in the morals of men, which are better or worse at one time than at another,—the democratic influences of the Catholic religion, that titles of dignity and honor (not mere designations of official position, although these may, in some cases, have afterwards degenerated into titular vanities) are so extremely rare as to be almost absolutely wanting in the funeral inscriptions of the early Christians. Yet, as if to show that, in their opinion, the only true nobility came from the new birth of baptism, and that to be "children of the saints" was the higher boast, one only species of epigraphic pride is found perpetuated among them on the tombs of those who, not themselves converts, but born of Christian parents, could boast of a Christian ancestry; *Fidelis ex Fidelibus:* "A Christian sprung from Christians." This was evidently a formula devised to challenge the haughty claim of Roman patricians, so often put forward on their monuments; *Consul ex consulibus:* "A consul born of consuls." The laudatory grandiloquence of the heathen inscriptions on one side of the long gallery leading up to the Vatican museum, and the humble simplicity of the Christian ones, which are set up on the opposite wall, is very remarkable. *Si parva cum magnis componere licet*, it reminds the tourist from the North of a somewhat similar contrast when, turning from the magnificent marble

and the pompous eulogy of John, Duke of Argyle and Greenwich, in Westminster Abbey, he looks up at the plain little tablet, over which a mother's heart has bled, so touchingly inscribed, "Jane Lister: dear childe." Nothing more. And, while on this subject of funeral inscriptions, let us note that in an ancient Jewish catacomb, discovered while we were in Rome, there are singular proofs of what is so well expressed in French by *opposition sourde* to the Christian religion; for as Tertullian said in the third century, "From the days of the Apostles the synagogue has been a source of persecution." The inscriptions recovered there have been set up *in situ*, and our dear friend and teacher, the late Father Garrucci, who published an account of this Hebrew cemetery, has pointed out a peculiarity in the inscriptions, many of which are of Greek and Latin proselytes, which shows the minuteness of Jewish opposition to the early Christians; namely, that although they used the Hellenic form EN EIPHNH,—"In peace,"—yet whenever they employed the Latin language, instead of giving the Greek equivalent they rendered it by *ex bonis*, with the evident intention of avoiding the well-known and peculiarly Christian acclamation, *In Pace*.

The custom of burying their dead outside of the walls of towns and cities was followed by the Christians up to about the time of Constantine. This prince and first Christian emperor gave a contrary example by selecting, with the approval of the ecclesiastical authorities, a place of sepulture in the vestibule of the Basilica of the Holy Apostles, which he had erected at Constantinople. There are other examples of intramural burial both in the East and West in the same century, although it became common and, we might say, the rule, only in the fifth century. One great reason for so radical a change was the repeated incursions of the barbarians who filled up the catacombs, rifled and overturned the tombs and whatever other monuments stood outside of the cities, within whose walls alone the inhabitants felt a little secure. The long and double line of ruined tombs along that queen of roads, the *Via Appia*, leading out of Rome, is an example of the devastations of the barbarians. The earlier exceptions to extramural burial were made only in favor of persons renowned for piety or of eminent rank. Thus St. Gregory of Nazianzen commemorates the burial of Livia, wife of Amphilochius, in the temple of the martyrs; and in the same locality were buried this great bishop's mother, brother and nephew. In this same fourth century, St. Ephraim, the Syrian, desired in his will, through a spirit of humble self-abasement, not to be buried in any part of the house of God; but on the other hand, the celebrated friend of St. Jerome, the Roman matron, Paula, was buried at Jerusalem in the church and beside the sepulchre of Christ, as St. Jerome narrates in his 27th

letter. St. John Chrysostom tells us in one of his Homilies (the 26th, on the II. Ep. to the Corinthians), that the Emperors Theodosius and Honorius followed the example of Constantine; although so many persons now sought a resting-place for their mortal remains in the churches, that the Emperors Gratian and Valentinian (364–375), had been obliged to try to repress such an abuse by insisting on the full observance of the law which forbade intramural burials. These burials were at first granted as great privileges, principally to bishops, priests and consecrated virgins; and if to persons of other conditions, it was only by reason of their being notable benefactors or powerful protectors of the Church. Thus, St. John Chrysostom was buried, says the historian, Socrates, in the Church of the Apostles, at Constantinople, and St. Ambrose selected for himself, during life, a place underneath the altar of the basilica, since called Ambrosian, which he had erected. Innumerable examples now appear of bishops and priests being buried under those altars on which, in life, they had religiously offered the Perpetual Sacrifice. St. Hilary of Poictiers (France), who died about the year 367, insisted that the bodies of heretics and heathens should not be buried in the company of the saints, which is an explicit testimony to the ancient discipline of the Church, which is still in vigor, but which is so unjustly opposed by the strong arm of the law—might assuming to make right in some countries where those who hated, reviled and persecuted the Church and died outside of her communion are forced, after death, into her consecrated ground. Pope Pelagius II. (A. D., 578) protested very strongly against any general custom of burial within or even around the churches, because it was often a matter of sheer vanity and of trying to get into good society. Many Councils in Spain, France and Germany tried to stop burials in these holy places; but finally, in the sixth century, in Italy and, later on, in all countries, burials around the churches or in the porches, vestibules and cloisters, but not yet within the churches, became universal.

In the first ages the Church was at the expense of burying the dead, and as late as the time of St. Ambrose, towards the end of the fourth century, it was allowed to dispose of the sacred vessels of the altar, in cases of extreme necessity, in order to raise funds for burying the dead decently. Yet it is certain that, even in the very beginning, when Christians had all things in common, wealthy people, unwilling to put the community to any charge, used to procure for themselves while living a sepulchre for self, family, and sometimes friends; and Boldetti has given an inscription in which certain parents inscribed on a tomb that their son had purchased it for himself with his honest labor. Sometimes a tomb was given as a present to another, somewhat as the celebrated traveller and

missionary in China, Father Huc, told us that one of the most acceptable gifts which children could make to their parent—betokening a high degree of filial piety—was an elegant coffin. Father Lupi has preserved an inscription to this effect: "*Hunc locum donavit M. Orbius Helius amicus Karissimus.*" Probably the commonest manner of acquiring a particular burial place was by ordering it of a *Fossor* or grave-digger, and paying for it. When the era of peace dawned upon the Church, only the poor and friendless were buried at the expense of the Christian community. The great respect of Christians for their dead was expressed in a variety of formulas and sometimes of anathemas, which are met quite often on epitaphs of the earliest centuries. Father Lupi tells us that from his own observations, he is certain that about the time of the first Christian emperors there were some Christians who did not scruple to open the tombs of others in order to bury their own dead therein. There were even people so wicked as to rifle the tombs of the precious objects—especially personal ornaments of silver and gold—which were often interred with the deceased. Sometimes, as Cancelli, the great antiquary, assures us, the very marble slabs closing the berth-like graves in the catacombs or encasing the brick cores of over-ground tombs were stripped off and sold or burned to make lime, whence the satiric line on such degenerate people:

"Calcis in obsequium marmora dura coquunt."

With the advance of centuries we are struck by a severer and more dreadful form of imprecation against the sacrilegious violators of the dead (heathen did not count; the mausoleum of Hadrian, at *Castel Sant Angelo*, is still a fortress, and the tomb of Cæcilia Metella, on the Appian Way, was long a stronghold of the Gætani). Hence the subject of anathemas is a special and very curious department of the study of inscriptions. Bosius gives us this one against any would-be violator: "May he die miserably and stay unburied. May he lie and never rise again. May his part be with Judas. Let this happen to any one who shall violate my tomb." In the environs of Lyons this one was found: "If any one shall remove my bones from this grave, let my curse be upon him." Gazzera, in his "Inscriptions of Piedmont," has preserved the following: "If any one shall attempt to profane this sepulchre, may he incur the anger of God and be accurst." These rather violent imprecations and denunciations are of a comparatively late period, being especially common in the sixth century, when the barbarians were guilty of unheard-of outrages against the dead. At an earlier age, although we remark the same jealous care not

to have one's dead bones disturbed, it is expressed in more moderate language, as, for instance, this one dating from the fifth century, which De Rossi produces as the oldest known inscription embodying such a precaution in favor of one's tomb: "I adjure you, in the name of Christ, do no injury to me, neither to my tomb."

It is not superstition, but very commendable, to treat a grave with decency. It would seem to spring from an instinctive regard for the rights and feelings of others. It is not sentiment only, but a strong sense of an appeal to our better nature, that makes the pilgrim to Stratford Church, for instance, bend over, almost tearfully, to read the lines:

> "Good friend, for Jesus' sake forbear
> To dig the dust enclosed here:
> Blest be the man that spares these stones,
> And curst be he that moves my bones."

WINDTHORST.

THIS time a year ago, we tried to give the readers of the CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW a rapid sketch of the history of the "Centre Party," of its origin and its combats, of its hopes and of its victories. We passed in review many celebrated names dear to the hearts of the Catholics of Germany and of the entire world. One name, however, necessarily stood out from all the others; one name of more than ordinary renown in that extraordinary band; one name whose impress was on every page of that history so fruitful of suggestive instruction—the name of Windthorst. We followed this intrepid Maccabee from the beginning of his glorious career, and we have seen him grasp in hands trained to war the banner of that noble phalanx, which death had snatched from the immortal Mallinckrodt. We watched him as he marched at the head of his chosen band, everywhere and in all things a shining example of a courage that knew not defeat, of a prudence that was without peer, of a devotion that stood the test of every proof. With deepest admiration have we followed every turn of that war of the Titans, in which he was pitted against the most powerful statesmen of modern times. With sentiments of sincerest sympathy have we joined with Germany and the Catholic world in bestowing on its well beloved champion unmistakable proofs of hearty thankfulness and most unswerving devotion. Finally, from beyond the sea we saluted with respectful joy the unstained banner which the grand old man carried so valiantly, and we wished as a Catholic and a patriot that God would spare for many years to the church of Germany the best deserving of her sons, to the Fatherland the foremost of her citizens, to the Catholic people the most incomparable of her chieftains.

Two months later we had the good fortune to be able to express in person to this extraordinary man our sentiments of respect and veneration. It was at Coblentz at the annual Congress of German Catholics, toward the end of August, 1890. Thousands of Catholics were gathered there with their Bishops and their representatives. In a moment, a wave of excitement swept through the hall; "Windthorst, Windthorst," was the cry and every man rose to his feet. When "His Little Excellency" appeared at the rear of the assembly the enthusiasm of every heart found vent in rousing cheers. The old man advanced slowly, leaning on the arm of a friend; but his way was almost impeded, for the enthu-

siasm of the crowd seemed to forget his almost total blindness and his delicate constitution consequent on his eighty years.

It was an unique spectacle—an occasion at once full of grandeur and of consolation; a sight never to be forgotten by those who were so fortunate as to be witnesses of it. Certainly popular manifestations are neither rare nor difficult to obtain in the new world or in the old. The "aura popularis" has its caprices and its enthusiasm for those who know how to manage it with skill. But here there was nothing factitious, nothing of the artificial, nothing merely transitory. The applause was not given to a general distributing amongst his soldiers the spoils of war, nor to an emperor or a king prodigal of his favors, nor to a minister disposing of the treasures or the decorations of his sovereign; nor yet to a representative promising fat offices to his constituents. It was the meeting of two great souls, the soul of a whole people beating as one, with the soul of the tireless defender of its liberties, nay of the most precious of liberties—the liberty of the Faith. The most brilliant of his parliamentary triumphs were not to be compared with these spontaneous ovations, inspired by the deepest gratitude, by admiration the most sincere and by devotion the most disinterested.

Soon the president of the congress, Baron von Buol advanced to the tribune and announced: "Seine Excellenz, Herr Staatsminister, Dr. Windthorst, hat das wort." "His Excellency, the Minister of State, Dr. Windthorst, has the floor." The applause began again and only ended when the orator himself with his usual modesty and good nature requested silence. For near two hours an audience of from four to five thousand persons hung upon his lips. Frenzied applause broke out at the conclusion of almost every sentence. These manifestions of sympathy had a special reason and significance. Fears had been already expressed at this date with regard to Windthorst's health. It was anxiously debated whether it would be possible for him to honor the Congress with his presence. The inquiries which were heard on all sides touching his health had something particularly tender and touching in them. It was really the affection of children who were in danger of losing a beloved father. But Coblentz seemed to allay all these fears and to set all uneasiness at rest. Hearing our Windthorst speak in a voice so clear and full, with all the energy and marvellous talent which were his characteristics, we said with thankful hearts that that piercing eye would not be closed so soon and that vigorous soul would sustain for many a year that body weakened by so many labors. But there was one in that assembly who did not share in our hopes. It was Windthorst himself. It was believed that he had finished his discourse and the applause broke out

afresh—then he began in a voice marked with strong emotion the following significant words: "Gentlemen, I know not if I shall be able ever again to assist at one of our yearly Congresses. God alone knows; my life is in His hands. *If He does not deign to grant me the favor to be in your midst again, I pray you that you will keep my memory green in your hearts and that your prayers will follow me.*"

These words caused deep emotion in the whole assembly. The orator on retiring seemed to hide the tears wrung from him by this sad presentiment and by the expression of popular feeling. Tears stood in many eyes but at the same time, in struggle against the impression produced by words so sad, many did violence to themselves and cried out: "*Unser Windthorst darf noch nicht sterben! Gott wird ihn uns noch lange erhalten!*" "Our Windthorst must not die yet! God will preserve him still longer to us." But the predominating sentiment was one of filial sorrow which found vent in the silent promise made in a thousand hearts: "No, beloved and venerated leader, we will never forget thee and our prayer shall never cease in thy behalf."

After this memorable occasion, we had the honor of shaking hands for the last time with the man who on that day, more than ever before, concentrated in himself all the interest and hopes of Catholic Germany. That great soul sympathized with every noble cause. Catholic in full force of the term he was interested in the religious matters of every land. He spoke to us enthusiastically of the glorious Centenary Celebration at Baltimore, of our beloved University, of his desire to see the day "When Germany would be so free as to allow Catholics to found a like institution;" then he added, "Salute for me the brave Catholics of free America; they too, I hope, will pray for me."

II.

It is said that death has something peculiarly humiliating for those who during life have been classed among "great men." It is easy to understand that nothing can be more humiliating than that inexorable command! So far and no farther! "*Ingredere viam universæ terræ!*" "Enter the way of all flesh." But there is a greatness which can triumph over even the authority of this despotism; it is the greatness founded on true humility; the grandeur of the soul that at the foot of the Cross hears the freedom-giving words: *O mors ero mors tua!* "O death I shall be thy death!" Windthorst possessed this true greatness and that is why his death teaches us such a consoling and instructive lesson. Let us go into the unpretentious little room in the Jacobstrasse, Berlin, where the hero is fighting his last battle. His

death will show itself to us as the worthy crowning of his life, and at the same time will bring into a stronger light the true reason of his high achievements and the signal virtues that distinguished him as a citizen and as a Christian.

We do not intend to insist on that extraordinary power with which his intellect seemed to fight the rebellion of a body which appeared to refuse its services before its time. Certainly we could not read without deepest sadness that the inexorable disease could not stifle the noble thoughts which filled this vigorous soul. Certainly the sight of Windthorst speaking during the paroxysms of the fever—speaking at the top of his voice, as if he were in the tribune—for the precious souls of the children which he saw menaced by a vexatious law; the spectacle of this master of parliamentary oratory, in a supreme effort of his eloquence, beseeching the Government to allow the exiled religious to take their place in the bloody fight between society and socialism; the sight of this the most illustrious citizen of the empire giving for the last time, on his death-bed, a striking proof of his fidelity to his sovereign and thus confounding by the most eloquent of protestations, the accusations of his most terrible adversary; the sight, in fine, of this the most venerated of party leaders, urging with his dying voice on his beloved "Centre" the conservation of that union which he had always maintained intact and unassailable—certainly, we say, all these things show us the dying splendors of a powerful genius, the noblest aspirations of a soul deeply penetrated with its sublime mission and its sacred duties. It is not this, however, that has attracted our attention or has led us to speak of the death of Windthorst. What particularly touched and edified us was precisely the Christian simplicity of that death, the perfect resignation and the humble faith which all its circumstances showed forth. Here is the simple narrative as we take it from a German paper: "As soon as the sickness assumed a serious form, Windthorst asked for a priest. He confessed his sins to the minister of God and received the holy Viaticum. The piety which he manifested in these solemn moments was really that of a child. Abandoning himself entirely to God he repeated in tones of most complete resignation the simple words:

Jesus dir leb' ich,
Jesus dir sterb' ich,
Jesus dein bin ich im Leben und im Tode.

Jesus, for Thee I live,
Jesus, for Thee I die,
Jesus, Thine am I in life and in death.

These prayers were on his lips during all the lucid intervals of

his sickness. At the end, with the words: "Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit," his great soul went to meet its God."

This simple recital is more eloquent in praise of this great man and especially of his great soul than the most flattering obituaries, than all the wreaths from emperor and people, that were laid upon his bier, than the royal pomp which the admiration of a noble sovereign and the love of a whole city—nay, of a whole people, lavished on the funeral of the man who during his life sought no other honor than that of serving his country and his God. We shall say more; this his death-bed shows us the true explanation of all the honors showered on his tomb and of all the success which he gained in his life. *Ecce quomodo justus moritur:* "Behold how the just man dieth." Windthorst was a man of faith. That faith was his strength and his consolation in his last hours because it was the support of all his life and because he lived by faith. It is this life of faith and in the faith which gives us the secret of the sublime mission given by God to this providential man and of the remarkable way in which he carried it out. On the other hand the world would never have witnessed the moving spectacle of the honor bestowed on the memory of the deputy of Meppen, by a grief not only national but even international, if all, friends and adversaries, emperor and ministers, deputies and citizens, the learned and the unlearned, had not honored in him a man of character; if all had not recognized in him the sincerity of that faith, which adorns the most beautiful qualities, which adds lustre even to the most striking talents and which gains the most wonderful victories. For this reason we do not intend to repeat here the description of these qualities, of these talents, and of these victories which are written forever in letters of gold on the page of history. The true history of a man is the history of the motives which inspired his actions. *Omnis gloria ejus ab intus.* "All his glory is from within." It is from this standpoint that we shall consider our hero.

III.

M. Stern, a Jewish writer, both impartial and judicious, has lately written the following memorable words: "We must not stop at the surface of things when judging of a man's greatness. Windthorst is celebrated everywhere as a master of parliamentary strategy, and this is but simple justice. But his qualities as a politician, eminent as they were, do not give sufficient explanation of the universal and cordial sympathy manifested towards this fighter. His political adversaries had for him more than the admiration which his talents exacted; they held him in positive

veneration, and the reasons for this lie deeper still. The respect manifested towards Windthorst had for its object in the first place, *the man of character*, the man thoroughly good, noble and disinterested, the intrepid champion who forced men to esteem him because he fought from conviction. Each one may have his own opinion of what Windthorst called the liberty of the Church, but one fact remains undeniable, that in an epoch when material interests everywhere ruled politics, he fought for an end which was truly ideal. While a system of policy based on brute force and on the empty applause of its servile adherents, seemed to celebrate its triumphs, Windthorst fought with intellectual arms alone, animated as he was and penetrated with unshaken faith in the victorious power of the idea of justice. We cannot imagine a greater contrast than that which existed between the chief actors in this struggle of giants. On the one side we see the most powerful of statesmen in his cuirassier's uniform, whose tall stature and the clanking of whose spurs threw his partisans into a species of extasy; on the other side, a man of small stature, bent, almost blind, whose walk was as circumspect as his speeches and his political actions, and still in spite of his insignificant person this tenacious parliamentary diplomat was by far the stronger man; and always working on a well thought-out plan, he finally checkmated the great hero of modern politics. As a man of character, he could be polished towards his adversaries, and never did he cast at any one the insulting phrase, "*Sie imponiren mir nicht.*" "You cannot impose on me." But in reality he was one of the few who did "impose" upon Bismarck, even when at the zenith of his power.

In fact, we find this "conviction," that is to say, this religious conviction, this Catholic conviction, in all the phases of his well filled life. A man of faith, and consequently a man of duty, a man filled wholly and entirely with the mission which Divine Providence had assigned him and with the responsibility consequent on that mission; this it was that made Windthorst, the "Pearl of Meppen," not only as an orator or party chief, but also as a Christian. In everything, moral superiority was for him the inspiration and guide of intellectual superiority. He is ours, entirely ours! that is why the Catholics of Germany, and the Catholics of the whole world are justly proud of him.

Windthorst, a man of work! A book both interesting and full of instruction could be written on this subject. But we must content ourselves with a few remarks. God, who had His designs upon him, had richly endowed him. A generous heart, a soul ardent and passionate in pursuit of the great and beautiful, a mind broad and penetrating, naturally inclined to the right, and with a

native propensity for the true—such were the gifts which admirably seconded the Christian education which he received from his parents on the farm at Westercappel, near Osnabrück. While engaged in the study of the humanities and at the University, these precious qualities were not, as too often happens, turned from their true goal by the sallies of youth. Even from the days of early temptation and first combats, religion took him upon her wings and soared to heights whence he looked with wholesome repugnance on all the frivolity of pleasure. According to the unanimous testimony of his former teachers and fellow-students, he was remarkable, not only for his distinguished talents, but also for "exemplary conduct," as the certificates of that time express it. Notably did he signalize himself by determined, persevering and orderly work, by disinterested labor, and—as even then he knew how to make sacrifices—by the renunciation of many, even legitimate, enjoyments.

Multa tulit fecitque puer, sudavit et alsit,
Abstinuit venere et vino.

One of his former professors has given in a few words a faithful portrait of him which depicts his exterior unfavored by the gifts of nature, his penetrating mind and the depth of his feelings. "*Ein grundgescheidter Kopf von ungemeiner Sehkraft, und trotz seines häkligen Wesens von rührender Pietät.*"

We do not mean that Windthorst was ever attracted to that *austere* virtue to which some believe themselves called. Good humor and a jovial vein were, on the contrary, his striking characteristics. His virtue was *lovable*, and that is one of the secrets of his great influence. This pearl was in his case set off by that polish of heart and mind which had nothing worldly about it, nothing egoistical, nothing far fetched, always thoughtful, always at one's service, never stooping to anything low. Up to the last days of his life, this social virtue made him the centre of attraction of every meeting—in families or elsewhere, and the Catholic students of the German Universities, whether they wore "colors" or went without them (*mit farben und ohne farben*), will specially regret the "honorary member" who enlivened their young hearts with his witty speeches, who did not disdain to wear the kepi and the other insignia of his dignity as "Alter Herr" or "Philister" or "Ehrenmitglied;" who would "command" a "salamander" with an art which would have made the heart of a "bemoostes Haupt" of a score of "Semesters" wild with jealousy. He loved to recall to their minds the words of the wise man: "*Animus gaudens aetatem floridam facit; Spiritus tristis exsiccat ossa.*" (Prov. xvii., 22).

"A joyful mind maketh age flourishing; A sorrowful spirit drieth up the bones." He could improvise most charmingly on a certain sadness which enervates, on an interesting melancholy which breaks young hearts. But never did his words want the serious note. "*Ridendo dicere verum*," "Joking to speak the truth," was one of his many accomplishments. He never lost the opportunity of reminding his "Commilitonen" that true gayety is the privilege of the virtuous, or of those who work hard; that excess is the bane of relaxation, and that "Frühschoppen" should never be the consequence of too prolonged a vigil, and that it was by far more suitable for the days of vacation than for the days of the "Vorlesungen" (lectures).

We may well say that love of work was a real and noble passion in this extraordinary man. There is no exaggeration that the motto of St. Paul, *Impendam et superimpendam*, "I will spend and be spent myself," was also his motto, and that he faithfully lived up to it in the lay apostolate to which Providence had called him. An eye-witness, M. Nienkämper, of Berlin, one of the foremost journalists of Germany, speaks thus on this subject. After Windthorst's death he devoted a few touching lines to the memory of the departed chief in which he described the punctuality and scrupulous regularity with which Windthorst put into practice the advice of the Holy Ghost: "*Particula boni doni non te prætereat.*" "Let not a particle of the good gift overpass thee." We see Windthorst arriving punctually in Berlin on the opening of the Reichstag and of the Landtag, attending all the meetings, giving the deepest attention to every delicate and difficult question, presiding over the most important committees, devoting his evenings, and even parts of the night, in granting interviews as well to the most distinguished statesmen as to the most humble citizen, giving orders or advice orally or through his secretary to all parts of the country. "I am certain," says M. Nienkämper, "that our Windthorst would be alive yet if the long parliamentary sessions of these later times had not killed him. . . . The repose so necessary to him was denied him altogether. . . . There was not in him, however, the slightest trace of temerity or too great confidence in himself; he knew well that his health was seriously threatened. He believed, however, that he was bound not to spare himself. He did his duty to the end, and left the rest to God. It may be objected, why did not the doctors or his friends warn him? That is easily said; but how could you force a conscientious general to lie on a sofa smoking a cigar while his troops must carry an important position of the enemy? . . . Thus it was that our Windthorst was faithful even unto death. He was a true hero, whom the approach of death itself could not turn for a moment from doing his duty.

And what was still more beautiful in his character, this heroism was entirely unalloyed by any trace of vanity or of pride. . . . He did not hide from himself the difficulties or dangers of a situation. . . . he saw them, in fact, better than any one else; in very truth he worked 'in fear and trembling,' but at the same time with unshakable confidence in that God whose cause he was convinced he was sustaining. It was thus that the 'little hero' triumphed over the 'big hero,' drunken with success and with pride. . . . But if Windthorst was living to-day, he would say in his modesty and simplicity: 'It was the goodness of our cause which accomplished all; I had the Catholic people behind me; besides, never forget, that God knows how to bring about all He wills by means of the weakest instruments.'"

"Yes, beloved chief," exclaims M. Nienkämper, "you have been always the *servant* of the cause of God and of His Church. In that title we find the secret of your numberless good deeds and of your great success; the secret of your unassuming bravery, and of the irresistible influence which you exercised over us all; the secret of your unbounded devotion and of your wonderful calm, even in the midst of the most perplexing cases. And thus it was, in fine, that you became the David of right against the Goliath of wrong!"

IV.

The decisive, and, we may say, the most critical epoch in the life of Windthorst fell in the year 1866. The King of Hanover, the faithful ally of Austria, was defeated in the battle of Langensalza; the kingdom was annexed to Prussia. Windthorst, formerly a deputy to the Hanoverian Chamber, and King George's Minister of Justice, held at this time a high position in the Court. The annexation of the kingdom appeared to end his career. Another, however, more brilliant and more lucrative, opened up before him. Prussia received with open arms those of her new subjects who offered her their services. The three men she regarded most favorably were those who were called later on "*die drei feinen Kopfe*," "the three soreheads" of Hanover: Bennigsen, Miquel, Windthorst. They were characterized as follows: "The first is very able, the second is still abler, and the third is abler than the other two put together." Bennigsen and Miquel hastened to adore the rising sun, and were soon basking in the rays of public favor.[1] What is Windthorst to do? Why not follow their example? Why, surpassing them as you do in oratorical and administrative ability, why mourn for the breaking of a royal crown

[1] Miquel is now Minister of Finance and Bennigsen, President of the province of Hanover, is anxiously awaiting a portfolio.

—for a cause which is entirely lost? Would you bury your talents in sterile silence, in useless protestations? You are not rich; think of your family. Berlin has many resources; they are open to you. Your two sons must have a career; it will be a brilliant one if you so desire. Bismarck, who knows what a man is, will very soon find you the position you want. Away, therefore, with useless regrets. Grasp the opportunity. The king is dead! long live the king!

These "invitations" were not purely internal temptations; they were formally made in the study of the ex-legal adviser of the crown of Hanover.[1] But those who made these overtures were deceived in their man. They thought they had to do with a "*Streber*" and they found themselves dealing with a man of character. Such a man does not change masters as he changes his coat. Never will he approve what he believes to be unjust; never will he approve the forcible dethronement of his king to whom he has sworn allegiance! This determination will close every career to him. It matters little! Victrix causa diis placuit, victa Catoni! And this resolution will stand unshaken before the most seductive promises as well as before the most haughty threats.

> "Scilicet ut fulvum spectatur in ignibus aurum,
> Tempore sic duro est inspicienda fides."

What, then, is Windthorst to do? Must he retire into his corner alone? No. He is a man of character, and he is also a Christian by conviction. He is conscious of the duties which Providence has placed upon him. The cause of justice and of religion needs defenders in Berlin; patriotism demands that he consecrate his abilities to the good of his country. He will therefore go to Berlin, sent by the confidence of his Catholic fellow-citizens. He will take his seat in the Chamber—in both chambers (Landtag and Reichstag), but he will be found in the midst of those who seek not their own interests; he will place himself at the side of Mallinckrodt, Reichensperger, Schorlemer, and soon he himself will carry the glorious flag which bears on one side the inscription, "*Lasciate ogni speranza voi che c' entrate*," "no hope of advancement for you"; on the contrary, abuse, insult and calumny; and on the other side, the noble words, "*Für Wahrheit, Freiheit und Recht!*" "For Truth, for Liberty and for Right!"

We shall say nothing of the war waged by the "man of iron" on the deputy of Meppen. God has avenged the faithful servant of faith and fatherland. He who once could not hurl abuse enough

[1] A Liberal paper wrote after Windthorst's death: "We are sorry only for one thing, that is, they did not *succeed in gaining over* this man in 1866."

on the man he stigmatized as a "Guelf," "Particularist," "enemy of the empire and of the emperor"; to-day, the glory of this "Guelf" disturbs his sleep in his involuntary retreat in the Sachsenwald, where he exhibits to the world the sad spectacle of a man of talent and success, as great as his character is little; a man without true dignity, without true loyalty in his disgrace. And, while an emperor bows respectfully before the bier of Windthorst, Bismarck has the baseness to insult, in his newspaper, the memory of the greatest and the noblest of his adversaries, one of whose chief titles to fame is, that he was great in misfortune, and never abused his superiority, to wound, much less to insult, the least of his enemies.

V.

Great in misfortune, great in the days of trial and persecution, this is the more admirable because it is the most heroic virtue of the man of faith. It was only after Windthorst's death that people knew to what a high degree he merited this title to the admiration of his contemporaries and posterity. During the first years, of his parliamentary career in Berlin he lost one after the other, three of his four children, in the flower of their youth,—his two sons and one daughter. The father's heart was broken; the Christian's strength was his support in the hour of trial. These terrible blows were to this man of faith another warning to consecrate himself more and more to his duty. Let us hear his own words, which Mr. Stern cites with well merited admiration:

"If heaven had left me my sons I should never have been able to fill my position in political life. For I am not at all rich and my position necessitates many expenses. . . And then you know I do not like to live at another's cost; I must be thoroughly independent of all; that is why I do not accept anything from any one . . . . I believe that a God governs this world and I strive to serve Him . . . . You may say perhaps that I am a survival of the old world—that I am out of fashion—but let me add that this faith has been my sole happiness and my only stay."

On the 15th of May of this year, the day after the death of their leader, the Centre held the saddest meeting in its history. The soldiers mourned their general, the children their father. The Nestor of the party, Mr. Peter Reichensperger, a man eighty-four years old, stood up, and with a voice broken with emotion, expressed the grief of all and added: "I have fought longer by the side of our dead leader than any of you; and, if I were to sum up his whole life in a word, I would say, that it has been the life of a *glorious martyrdom.*

These words of the venerable veteran of the Centre Party tell us more of the public life, and especially of the private life of

Windthorst than the most detailed exposition could do. They bring before our minds the Christian hero, who, when overwhelmed with grief for the loss of his children, blessed the chastening hand of God; the loving and beloved husband and father, renouncing for ten months of the year the comforts and pleasures of the domestic hearth because his duty called him to the combat; the faithful servant, saddened by the violent dethronement of his king; the eminent statesman roughly cut short in one of the most honorable of careers; the great parliamentarian who for twenty years was the object of the blackest calumnies, of the most implacable hate, of the most unworthy persecution; the devoted Catholic who felt in his own heart the cruel stabs aimed at the heart of his Holy Mother, the Church; the party leader who had to maintain in perfect union, at the price of personal sacrifices known only to God, elements most widely differing in character and in political aspirations; the intrepid general whom nothing could dismay, whom nothing could defeat, neither the violence of hostile attack nor the cowardice nor temerity of his own soldiers. In a word Windthorst whether as private citizen, public leader, or son of the Church, was a martyr of devotion to his country and to his religion, in the cause of "truth, of liberty and of justice." All other glories fade before this. It is the only one which is meritorious and therefore the only one which is imperishable; for his true crown, his real reward is with Him who alone is the Eternal Truth, Perfect Liberty, and Immutable Justice.

WINDTHORSTIO.

I.

MEMORIÆ . ET . NOMINI
LUDOVICI . WINDTHORSTII
DOMO . OSTERCAPPELLIO . IN . HANNOVERA
A . FIDE . IMMOTA . PRUDENTIA . SINGULARI
DISERTI . PECTORIS . FACUNDIA
EXIMIUM . DECUS
DUXIT
CIVIUM . SUORUM . PRÆSIDIUM . ET . DELICIUM
DIVINA . JURA TEMPORUM . ACERBITATE . PESSUMDATA
ASSERUIT . VINDICAVIT
RELIGIONIS . ET LIBERTATIS . HOSTES
PROFLIGAVIT . FREGIT
QUA . SOL . PROMIT . QUA . CONDIT . DIEM
CHRISTIANUM . NOMEN
EVEXIT
DECESSIT . BEROLINI . LEONIS . XIII . P . M .
GUILELMI . II . GERM . IMP . BONORUMQUE . OMNIUM
DOLORE . HONESTATUS,
PRID . ID . MART . A . MDCCCLXXXXI
A . N . LXXIX . M . II . D . III,
AMERICA . CATHOLICA
LAUDES . ET . LACRUMAS

II.

PRÆCLARAM . JURIS . SCIENTIAM .
MULTIGENA . ERUDITIONE
EXORNAVIT
NEGLIGENS . HONORUM . ET . VOLUPTATUM
OMNE . TEMPUS
REI . CATHOLICÆ . PROVEHENDÆ
TRANSMISIT

III.

WINDTHORSTIO
NEMO . IN . LICENDO . FORTIOR
NEMO . NOBILIOR
CUI . UNICE . CURÆ . FUIT
RELIGIO . ET . PATRIA

IV.

PRO . "VERITATE . LIBERTATE . JUSTITIA"
ACERRIME . IN . COMITIIS
DEPRÆLIANTI
TRIPLEX . AES . CIRCA . PECTUS
EJUS . JUDICIUM
NEC . FLECTI . GRATIA . NEC . PERFRINGI . POTENTIA
NEC . ADULTERARI . PECUNIA
POTUIT

V.

COELESTI . FRETUS . PRÆSIDIO
TENACI . POPULI . FIDE
SUFFULTUS
HOSTIS . POTENTISSIMI[1]
IRAM . ET . FUROREM . RISIT
ANIMUMQUE . ET . OPES
A . MINIS . A . STRAGE . AC . IPSO . FERRO
DUXIT

VI.

PERCUSSIS . PASTORIBUS
CIVITATIS . DEI
VIGIL . CUSTODIA . MUROS . SERVAVIT
ANIMO . ASSIDUE . EXCUBANS
NE . QUID . DETRIMENTI
RES . CHRISTIANA . CAPERET[2]

---

[1] Bismarck, the Iron Chancellor.

[2] Windthorst's extraordinary quickness of action and diplomatic foresight gave rise to the saying: "His Little Excellency rises very early." And when through the wisdom and dexterity of the leader of the Centre party, the blows aimed by Bismarck for the destruction of that party fell harmless, men would say: "Again the little fellow got up very early; no one can get ahead of him."

VII.

MARIA.

MAGNA . DEI . PARENS
SPES . ET . TUTELA . CHRISTIANI . NOMINIS
TE . SUPPLICI . POSCIMUS . PRECE
UT . CŒLI . SEDIBUS . INSERAS
LUDOVICUM . WINDTHORSTIUM
QUI . TE . AUSPICE . REM . CATHOLICAM
MIRIFICE . AUCTAVIT
PECUNIAM . SIBI . OBLATAM
SACRIS . ÆDIBUS . TUO . NOMINI . STRUENDIS
ADDICTAM . VOLUIT
TUAMQUE . AD . ARAM
EX . DIUTINO . LABORE
IN . PACE . CHRISTI . QUIESCIT[1]

---

[1] On the occasion of the golden jubilee of his marriage the Catholics of Germany presented Windthorst with a purse of 100,000 marks. He refused the gift, but asked that it be devoted to the erection of a church dedicated to the Blessed Mother of God, in the Protestant city of Hanover. During his lifetime he had collected faithfully for this his darling church. It will be his loveliest memorial. His body is buried within its walls.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF POPE LEO XIII.

To our Venerable Brethren, All Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops of the Catholic World, in grace and communion with the Apostolic See

Venerable Brethren, Health and Apostolic Benediction.

IT is not surprising that the spirit of revolutionary change, which has so long been predominant in the nations of the world, should have passed beyond politics and made its influence felt in the cognate field of practical economy. The elements of a conflict are unmistakable; the growth of industry, and the surprising discoveries of science; the changed relations of masters and workmen; the enormous fortunes of individuals, and the poverty of the masses; the increased self-reliance and the closer mutual combination of the working population; and, finally, a general moral deterioration. The momentous seriousness of the present state of things just now fills every mind with painful apprehension; wise men discuss it; practical men propose schemes; popular meetings, legislatures, and sovereign princes, all are occupied with it—and there is nothing which has a deeper hold on public attention.

Therefore, Venerable Brethren, as on former occasions, when it seemed opportune to refute false teaching, We have addressed you in the interests of the Church and of the common weal, and have issued Letters on Political Power, on Human Liberty, on the Christian Constitution of the State, and on similar subjects, so now We have thought it useful to speak on the Condition of Labor. It is a matter on which We have touched once or twice already. But in this Letter the responsibility of the Apostolic office urges Us to treat the question expressly and at length, in order that there may be no mistake as to the principles which truth and justice dictate for its settlement. The discussion is not easy, nor is it free from danger It is not easy to define the relative rights and the mutual duties of the wealthy and of the poor, of capital and of labor. And the danger lies in this, that crafty agitators constantly make use of these disputes to pervert men's judgments and to stir up the people to sedition.

But all agree, and there can be no question whatever, that some remedy must be found, and quickly found, for the misery and wretchedness which press so heavily at this moment on the large majority of the very poor. The ancient workmen's Guilds were destroyed in the last century, and no other organization took their place. Public institutions and the laws have repudiated the ancient religion. Hence by degrees it has come to pass that Working Men have been given over, isolated and defenceless, to the callousness of employers and the greed of unrestrained competition. The evil has been increased by rapacious Usury, which, although more than once condemned by the Church, is, nevertheless, under a different form but with the same guilt, still practised by avaricious and grasping men. And to this must be added the custom of working by contract, and the concentration of so many branches of trade in the hands of a few individuals, so that a small number of very rich men have been able to lay upon the masses of the poor a yoke little better than slavery itself.

To remedy these evils the *Socialists*, working on the poor man's envy of the rich, endeavor to destroy private property, and maintain that individual possessions should become the common property of all, to be administered by the State or by municipal bodies. They hold that, by thus transferring property from private persons to the community, the present evil state of things will be set to rights, because each citizen will then have his equal share of whatever there is to enjoy. But their proposals are so clearly futile for all practical purposes, that if they were carried out the working man himself would be among the first to suffer. Moreover, they are emphatically unjust, because they would rob the lawful possessor, bring the State into a sphere that is not its own, and cause complete confusion in the community.

It is surely undeniable, that when a man engages in remunerative labor, the very reason and motive of his work is to obtain property, and to hold it as his own private possession. If one man hires out to another his strength or his industry, he does this for the purpose of receiving in return what is necessary for food and living; he thereby expressly proposes to acquire a full and real right, not only to the remuneration, but also to the disposal of that remuneration as he pleases. Thus, if he lives sparingly, saves money, and invests his savings, for greater security, in land, the land in such a case is only his wages in another form; and, consequently, a working man's little estate thus purchased should be as completely at his own disposal as the wages he receives for his labor. But it is precisely in this power of disposal that ownership consists, whether the property be land or movable goods. The *Socialists*, therefore, in endeavoring to transfer the possessions of

individuals to the community, strike at the interests of every wage-earner, for they deprive him of the liberty of disposing of his wages, and thus of all hope and possibility of increasing his stock and of bettering his condition in life.

What is of still greater importance, however, is that the remedy they propose is manifestly against justice. For every man has by nature the right to possess property as his own. This is one of the chief points of distinction between man and the animal creation. For the brute has no power of self-direction, but is governed by two chief instincts, which keep his powers alert, move him to use his strength, and determine him to action without the power of choice. These instincts are self-preservation and the propagation of the species. Both can attain their purpose by means of things which are close at hand; beyond their surroundings the brute creation cannot go, for they are moved to action by sensibility alone, and by the things which sense perceives. But with man it is different indeed. He possesses, on the one hand, the full perfection of animal nature, and therefore he enjoys, at least as much as the rest of the animal race, the fruition of the things of the body. But animality, however perfect, is far from being the whole of humanity, and is indeed humanity's humble handmaid, made to serve and obey. It is the mind or the reason, which is the chief thing in us who are human beings; it is this which makes a human being human, and distinguishes him essentially and completely from the brute. And on this account—viz., that man alone among animals possesses reason—it must be within his right to have things not merely for temporary and momentary use, as other living beings have them, but in stable and permanent possession; he must have not only things which perish in the using, but also those which, though used, remain for use in the future.

This becomes still more clearly evident if we consider man's nature a little more deeply. For man, comprehending by the power of his reason things innumerable, and joining the future with the present—being, moreover, the master of his own acts—governs himself by the foresight of his counsel, under the eternal law and the power of God Whose Providence governs all things. Wherefore it is in his power to exercise his choice, not only on things which regard his present welfare, but also on those which will be for his advantage in time to come. Hence man not only can possess the fruits of the earth, but also the earth itself; for of the products of the earth he can make provision for the future. Man's needs do not die out, but recur; satisfied to-day, they demand new supplies to-morrow. Nature, therefore, owes to man a

storehouse that shall never fail, the daily supply of his daily wants. And this he finds only in the inexhaustible fertility of the earth.

Nor must we, at this stage, have recourse to the State. Man is older than the State; and he holds the right of providing for the life of his body prior to the formation of any State. And to say that God has given the earth to the use and enjoyment of the universal human race, is not to deny that there can be private property. For God has granted the earth to mankind in general; not in the sense that all without distinction can deal with it as they please, but rather that no part of it has been assigned to any one in particular, and that the limits of private possession have been left to be fixed by man's own industry and the laws of individual peoples. Moreover the earth, though divided among private owners, ceases not thereby to minister to the needs of all; for there is no one who does not live on what the land brings forth. Those who do not possess the soil, contribute their labor; so that it may be truly said that all human subsistence is derived either from labor on one's own land, or from some laborious industry which is paid for either in the produce of the land itself or in that which is exchanged for what the land brings forth.

Here, again, we have another proof that private ownership is according to nature's law. For that which is required for the preservation of life, and for life's well-being, is produced in great abundance by the earth, but not until man has brought it into cultivation and lavished upon it his care and skill. Now, when man thus spends the industry of his mind and the strength of his body in procuring the fruits of nature, by that act he makes his own that portion of nature's field which he cultivates—that portion on which he leaves, as it were, the impress of his own personality; and it cannot but be just that he should possess that portion as his own, and should have a right to keep it without molestation.

These arguments are so strong and convincing that it seems surprising that certain obsolete opinions should now be revived in opposition to what is here laid down. We are told that it is right for private persons to have the use of the soil and the fruits of their land, but that it is unjust for any one to possess as owner either the land on which he has built or the estate which he has cultivated. But those who assert this do not perceive that they are robbing man of what his own labor has produced. For the soil which is tilled and cultivated with toil and skill, utterly changes its condition; it was wild before, it is now fruitful; it was barren, and now it brings forth in abundance. That which has thus altered and improved it, becomes so truly part of itself as to be in great measure indistinguishable and inseparable from it. Is it just that

the fruit of a man's sweat and labor should be enjoyed by another? As effects follow their cause, so it is just and right that the results of labor should belong to him who has labored.

With reason, therefore, the common opinion of mankind, little affected by the few dissentients who have maintained the opposite view, has found in the study of nature, and in the law of Nature herself, the foundations of the division of property, and has consecrated by the practice of all ages the principle of private ownership, as being pre-eminently in conformity with human nature, and as conducing in the most unmistakable manner to the peace and tranquillity of human life. The same principle is confirmed and enforced by the civil laws—laws which, as long as they are just, derive their binding force from the law of nature. The authority of the Divine Law adds its sanction, forbidding us in the gravest terms even to covet that which is another's:—*Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife; nor his house, nor his field, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything which is his.*[1]

The rights here spoken of, belonging to each individual man, are seen in a much stronger light if they are considered in relation to man's social and domestic obligations.

In choosing a state of life, it is indisputable that all are at full liberty either to follow the counsel of Jesus Christ as to virginity, or to enter into the bonds of marriage. No human law can abolish the natural and primitive right of marriage, or in any way limit the chief and principal purpose of marriage, ordained by God's authority from the beginning. *Increase and multiply.* Thus we have the family; the "society" of a man's own household; a society limited indeed in numbers, but a true "society," anterior to every kind of State or nation, with rights and duties of its own, totally independent of the commonwealth.

That right of property, therefore, which has been proved to belong naturally to individual persons, must also belong to a man in his capacity of head of a family; nay, such a person must possess this right so much the more clearly in proportion as his position multiplies his duties. For it is a most sacred law of nature that a father must provide food and all necessaries for those whom he has begotten; and, similarly, nature dictates that a man's children, who carry on, as it were, and continue his own personality, should be provided by him with all that is needful to enable them honorably to keep themselves from want and misery in the uncertainties of this mortal life. Now in no other way can a father effect this except by the ownership of profitable property, which he can transmit to his children by inheritance. A family, no less

[1] Deuteronomy, v., 21. [2] Genesis, i., 28.

than a State, is, as We have said, a true society, governed by a power within itself, that is to say, by the father. Wherefore, provided the limits be not transgressed which are prescribed by the very purposes for which it exists, the Family has at least equal rights with the State in the choice and pursuit of those things which are needful to its preservation and its just liberty.

We say, at least equal rights; for, since the domestic household is anterior both in idea and in fact to the gathering of men into a commonwealth, the former must necessarily have rights and duties which are prior to those of the latter, and which rest more immediately on nature. If the citizens of a State—that is to say, the Families—on entering into association and fellowship, experienced, at the hands of the State, hindrance instead of help, and found their rights attacked instead of being protected, such association were rather to be repudiated than sought after.

The idea, then, that the civil government should, at its own discretion, penetrate and pervade the family and the household, is a great and pernicious mistake. True, if a family finds itself in great difficulty, utterly friendless, and without prospect of help, it is right that extreme necessity be met by public aid; for each family is a part of the commonwealth. In like manner, if within the walls of the household there occur grave disturbance of mutual rights, the public power must interfere to force each party to give the other what is due; for this is not to rob citizens of their rights, but justly and properly to safeguard and strengthen them. But the rulers of the State must go no further: Nature bids them stop here. Paternal authority can neither be abolished by the State, nor absorbed; for it has the same source as human life itself. "The child belongs to the father," and is, as it were, the continuation of the father's personality; and, to speak with strictness, the child takes its place in civil society not in its own right, but in its quality as a member of the family in which it is begotten. And it is for the very reason that "the child belongs to the father" that, as St. Thomas of Aquin says, "before it attains the use of free-will it is in the power and care of its parents."[1] The Socialists, therefore, in setting aside the parent and introducing the providence of the State, act *against natural justice*, and threaten the very existence of family life.

And such interference is not only unjust, but is quite certain to harass and disturb all classes of citizens and to subject them to odious and intolerable slavery. It would open the door to envy, to evil speaking, and to quarrelling; the sources of wealth would themselves run dry, for no one would have any interest in exerting

[1] St. Thomas, *Summa Theologica*, 2a 2æ Q. x. Art. 12.

his talents or his industry; and that ideal equality of which so much is said would in reality be the leveling down of all to the same condition of misery and dishonor.

Thus it is clear that the main tenet of *Socialism*, the community of goods, must be utterly rejected; for it would injure those whom it is intended to benefit; it would be contrary to the natural rights of mankind, and it would introduce confusion and disorder into the commonwealth. Our first and most fundamental principle, therefore, when we undertake to alleviate the condition of the masses, must be the inviolability of private property. This laid down, We go on to show where we must find the remedy that we seek.

We approach the subject with confidence, and in the exercise of the rights which belong to Us. For no practical solution of this question will ever be found without the assistance of Religion and of the Church. It is We who are the chief guardian of Religion and the chief dispenser of what belongs to the Church, and We must not by silence neglect the duty which lies upon Us. Doubtless this most serious question demands the attention and the efforts of others besides Ourselves—of the Rulers of States, of employers of labor, of the wealthy, and of the working population themselves for whom We plead. But We affirm without hesitation, that all the striving of men will be vain if they leave out the Church. It is the Church that proclaims from the Gospel those teachings by which the conflict can be put an end to, or at the least made far less bitter; the Church uses its efforts not only to enlighten the mind, but to direct by its precepts the life and conduct of man; the Church improves and ameliorates the condition of the working man by numerous useful organizations; does its best to enlist the services of all ranks in discussing and endeavoring to meet, in the most practical way, the claims of the working classes; and acts on the decided view that for these purposes recourse should be had, in due measure and degree, to the help of the law and of State authority.

Let it be laid down, in the first place, that humanity must remain as it is. It is impossible to reduce human society to a level. The *Socialists* may do their utmost, but all striving against nature is vain. There naturally exists among mankind innumerable differences of the most important kind; people differ in capability, in diligence, in health, and in strength; and unequal fortune is a necessary result of inequality in condition. Such inequality is far from being disadvantageous either to individuals or to the community; social and public life can only go on by the help of various kinds of capacity and the playing of many parts; and each man,

as a rule, chooses his part which peculiarly suits his case. As regards bodily labor, even had man never fallen from *the state of innocence*, he would not have been wholly unoccupied; but that which would then have been his free choice and his delight became afterwards compulsory, and the painful expiation of his sin. *Cursed be the earth in thy work; in thy labor thou shalt eat of it all the days of thy life.*[1] In like manner, the other pains and hardships of life will have no end or cessation on this earth; for the consequences of sin are bitter and hard to bear, and they must be with man as long as life lasts. To suffer and to endure, therefore, is the lot of humanity; let men try as they may, no strength and no artifice will ever succeed in banishing from human life the ills and troubles which beset it. If any there are who pretend differently —who hold out to a hard-pressed people freedom from pain and trouble, undisturbed repose, and constant enjoyment—they cheat the people and impose upon them, and their lying promises will only make the evil worse than before. There is nothing more useful than to look at the world as it really is—and at the same time to look elsewhere for a remedy to its troubles.

The great mistake that is made in the matter now under consideration is, to possess oneself of the idea that class is naturally hostile to class; that rich and poor are intended by nature to live at war with one another. So irrational and so false is this view, that the exact contrary is the truth. Just as the symmetry of the human body is the result of the disposition of the members of the body, so in a State it is ordained by nature that these two classes should exist in harmony and agreement, and should, as it were, fit into one another, so as to maintain the equilibrium of the body politic. Each requires the other; capital cannot do without labor, nor labor without capital. Mutual agreement results in pleasantness and good order; perpetual conflict necessarily produces confusion and outrage. Now, in preventing such strife as this, and in making it impossible, the efficacy of Christianity is marvellous and manifold. First of all, there is nothing more powerful than Religion (of which the Church is the interpreter and guardian) in drawing rich and poor together, by reminding each class of its duties to the other, and especially of the duties of justice. Thus Religion teaches the laboring man and the workman to carry out honestly and well all equitable agreements freely made; never to injure capital, nor to outrage the person of an employer; never to employ violence in representing his own cause, nor to engage in riot or disorder; and to have nothing to do with men of evil principles, who work upon the people with artful promises, and raise

[1] Genesis, iii., 17.

foolish hopes which usually end in disaster, and in repentance when too late. Religion teaches the rich man and the employer that their work-people are not their slaves; that they must respect in every man his dignity as a man and as a Christian; that labor is nothing to be ashamed of, if we listen to right reason and to Christian philosophy, but is an honorable employment, enabling a man to sustain his life in an upright and creditable way; and that it is shameful and inhuman to treat men like chattels to make money by, or to look upon them merely as so much muscle or physical power. Thus, again, Religion teaches that, as among the workman's concerns are Religion herself and things spiritual and mental, the employer is bound to see that the workman has time for the duties of piety; that he be not exposed to corrupting influences and dangerous occasions; and that he be not led away to neglect his home and family, or to squander his wages. Then, again, the employer must never tax his work-people beyond their strength, nor employ them in work unsuited to their sex or age. His great and principal obligation is to give to every one that which is just. Doubtless, before we can decide whether wages are adequate, many things have to be considered; but rich men and masters should remember this—that to exercise pressure for the sake of gain, upon the indigent and destitute, and to make one's profit out of the needs of another, is condemned by all laws, human and divine. To defraud any one of wages that are his due is a crime which cries to the avenging anger of Heaven. *Behold, the hire of the laborers . . . . which by fraud hath been kept back by you, crieth: and the cry of them hath entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth.*[1] Finally, the rich must religiously refrain from cutting down the workman's earnings, either by force, by fraud, or by usurious dealing; and with the more reason because the poor man is weak and unprotected, and because his slender means should be sacred in proportion to their scantiness.

Were these precepts carefully obeyed and followed, would not strife die out and cease?

But the Church, with Jesus Christ for its Master and Guide, aims higher still. It lays down precepts yet more perfect, and tries to bind class to class in friendliness and good understanding. The things of this earth cannot be understood or valued rightly without taking into consideration the life to come, the life that will last forever. Exclude the idea of futurity, and the very notion of what is good and right would perish; nay, the whole system of the universe would become a dark and unfathomable mystery. The great truth which we learn from Nature herself, is also the grand Christian

[1] St. James, v., 4.

dogma on which Religion rests as on its base—that when we have done with this present life then we shall really begin to live. God has not created us for the perishable and transitory things of earth, but for things heavenly and everlasting; He has given us this world as a place of exile, and not as our true country. Money, and the other things which men call good and desirable—we may have them in abundance, or we may want them altogether; as far as eternal happiness is concerned, it is no matter; the only thing that is important, is to use them aright. Jesus Christ, when He redeemed us with *plentiful redemption*, took not away the pains and sorrows which in such large proportion make up the texture of our mortal life; He transformed them into motives of virtue and occasions of merit; and no man can hope for eternal reward unless he follow in the bloodstained footprints of his Saviour. *If we suffer with Him, we shall also reign with Him.*[1] His labors and His sufferings, accepted by His own free will, have marvellously sweetened all suffering and all labor. And not only by His example, but by His grace and by the hope of everlasting recompense, He has made pain and grief more easy to endure; *for that which is at present momentary and light of our tribulation, worketh for us above measure exceedingly an eternal weight of glory.*[2]

Therefore, those whom fortune favors are warned that freedom from sorrow, and abundance of earthly riches, are no guarantee of the beatitude that shall never end, but rather the contrary;[3] that the rich should tremble at the threatenings of Jesus Christ—threatenings so strange in the mouth of Our Lord;[4] and that a most strict account must be given to the Supreme Judge for all that we possess. The chiefest and most excellent rule for the right use of money is one which the heathen philosophers indicated, but which the church has traced out clearly, and has not only made known to men's minds, but has impressed upon their lives. It rests on the principle that it is one thing to have a right to the possession of money, and another to have a right to use money as one pleases. Private ownership, as we have seen, is the natural right of man; and to exercise that right, especially as members of society, is not only lawful, but absolutely necessary. *It is lawful*, says St. Thomas of Aquin, *for a man to hold private property; and it is also necessary for the carrying on of human life.*[5] But if the question be asked, How must one's possessions be used? the Church replies, without hesitation, in the words of the same holy Doctor: *Man should not consider his outward possessions as his own, but as common to all, so*

---

[1] 2 Timothy, ii., 12.
[2] 2 Corinthians, iv., 17.
[3] St. Matthew, xix., 23, 24.
[4] St. Luke, vi., 24, 25.
[5] 2a 2æ Q., lxvi., Art. 2.

as to share them without difficulty when others are in need. Whence the Apostle saith, Command the rich of this world . . . . to give with ease, to communicate.[1] True, no one is commanded to distribute to others that which is required for his own necessities and those of his household; nor even to give away what is reasonably required to keep up becomingly his condition in life; *for no one ought to live unbecomingly.*[2] But when necessity has been supplied, and one's condition fairly considered, it is a duty to give to the indigent out of that which is over. *That which remaineth, give alms.*[3] It is a duty, not of justice (except in extreme cases), but of Christian charity—a duty which is not enforced by human law. But the laws and judgments of men must give place to the laws and judgments of Christ the true God, Who in many ways urges on His followers the practice of almsgiving—*It is more blessed to give than to receive;*[4] and Who will count a kindness done or refused to the poor as done or refused to Himself—*as long as you did it to one of My least brethren, you did it to Me.*[5] Thus, to sum up what has been said: Whoever has received from the Divine bounty a large share of blessings, whether they be external and corporeal or gifts of the mind, has received them for the purpose of using them for the perfecting of his own nature, and, at the same time, that he may employ them, as the minister of God's Providence, for the benefit of others. *He that hath a talent*, says St. Gregory the Great, *let him see that he hide it not; he that hath abundance, let him arouse himself to mercy and generosity; he that hath art and skill, let him do his best to share the use and the utility thereof with his neighbor.*[6]

As for those who do not possess the gifts of fortune, they are taught by the Church that, in God's sight poverty is no disgrace, and that there is nothing to be ashamed of in seeking one's bread by labor. This is strengthened by what we see in Christ Himself, Who, *whereas He was rich, for our sakes became poor;* and Who, being the Son of God, and God Himself, chose to seem and to be considered the son of a carpenter—nay, did not disdain to spend a great part of His life as a carpenter Himself. *Is not this the carpenter, the Son of Mary?*[7] From the contemplation of this Divine example it is easy to understand that the true dignity and excellence of man lies in his moral qualities, that is, in virtue; that virtue is the common inheritance of all, equally within reach of high and low, rich and poor; and that virtue, and virtue alone, wherever found, will be followed by the rewards of everlasting happiness. Nay, God Himself seems to incline more to those

---

[1] *Ibid.*, Q., lxv., Art. 2. [2] *Ibid.*, Q., xxxii., Art. 6. [3] St. Luke, xi., 41.
[4] Acts, xx., 35. [5] St. Matthew, xxv., 40.
[6] St. Gregory the Great. Hom. *in Evangel.*, n. 7. [7] St. Mark vi., 3.

who suffer evil; for Jesus Christ calls the poor blessed;[1] He lovingly invites those in labor and grief to come to Him for solace; and He displays the tenderest charity to the lowly and the oppressed. These reflections cannot fail to keep down the pride of those who are well off, and to cheer the spirit of the afflicted; to incline the former to generosity and the latter to tranquil resignation. Thus the separation which pride would make tends to disappear, nor will it be difficult to make rich and poor join hands in friendly concord.

But, if Christian precepts prevail, the two classes will not only be united in the bonds of friendship, but also in those of brotherly love. For they will understand and feel that all men are the children of the common Father, that is, of God; that all have the same last end, which is God Himself, who alone can make either men or angels absolutely and perfectly happy; that all and each are redeemed by Jesus Christ and raised to the dignity of children of God, and are thus united in brotherly ties both with each other and with Jesus Christ, *the firstborn among many brethren;* that the blessings of nature and the gifts of grace belong in common to the whole human race, and that to all, except to those who are unworthy, is promised the inheritance of the Kingdom of Heaven. *If sons, heirs also; heirs indeed of God, and co-heirs of Christ.*[3]

Such is the scheme of duties and rights which is put forth to the world by the Gospel. Would it not seem that strife must quickly cease were society penetrated with ideas like these?

But the Church, not content with pointing out the remedy, also applies it. For the Church does its utmost to teach and to train men, and to educate them; and by means of its Bishops and clergy it diffuses its salutary teachings far and wide. It strives to influence the mind, the heart, so that all may willingly yield themselves to be formed and guided by the commandments of God. It is precisely in this fundamental and principal matter, on which everything depends, that the Church has the power peculiar to itself. The agencies which it employs are given it for the very purpose of reaching the hearts of men, by Jesus Christ Himself, and derive their efficiency from God. They alone can touch the innermost heart and conscience, and bring men to act from a motive of duty, to resist their passions and appetites, to love God and their fellow-men with a love that is unique and supreme, and courageously to break down every barrier which stands in the way of a virtuous life.

---

[1] St. Matthew, v., 3: "*Blessed are the poor in spirit.*"

[2] *Ibid.*, xi., 28: "*Come to Me all you that labor and are burdened, and I will refresh you.*

[3] Romans, viii., 17.

On this subject We need only recall for one moment the examples written down in history. Of these things there cannot be the shadow of doubt: for instance, that civil society was renovated in every part by the teachings of Christianity; that in the strength of that renewal the human race was lifted up to better things—nay, that it was brought back from death to life, and to so excellent a life that nothing more perfect had been known before, or will come to pass in the ages that have yet to be. Of this beneficent transformation, Jesus Christ was at once the first cause and the final purpose; as from Him all came, so to Him all was to be referred. For when, by the light of the Gospel message, the human race came to know the grand mystery of the Incarnation of the Word and the redemption of man, the life of Jesus Christ, God and Man, penetrated every race and nation, and impregnated them with His faith, His precepts, and His laws. And if Society is to be cured now, in no other way can it be cured but by a return to the Christian life and Christian institutions. When a society is perishing, the true advice to give to those who would restore it is, to recall it to the principles from which it sprung; for the purpose and perfection of an association is to aim at and to attain that for which it was formed; and its operation should be put in motion and inspired by the end and object which originally gave it its being. So that to fall away from its primal constitution is disease; to go back to it is recovery. And this may be asserted with the utmost truth both of the State in general and of that body of its citizens—by far the greater number—who sustain life by labor.

Neither must it be supposed that the solicitude of the Church is so occupied with the spiritual concerns of its children as to neglect their interests temporal and earthly. Its desire is that the poor, for example, should rise above poverty and wretchedness, and should better their condition in life; and for this it strives. By the very fact that it calls men to virtue and forms them to its practice, it promotes this in no slight degree. Christian morality, when it is adequately and completely practised, conduces of itself to temporal prosperity, for it merits the blessing of that God who is the source of all blessings; it powerfully restrains the lust of possession and the lust of pleasure—twin plagues, which too often make a man without self-restraint miserable in the midst of abundance;[1] it makes men supply by economy for the want of means, teaching them to be content with frugal living, and keeping them out of the reach of those vices which eat up not merely small incomes, but large fortunes, and dissipate many a goodly inheritance.

Moreover, the Church intervenes directly in the interest of the

[1] "*The root of all evils is cupidity.*"—1 Tim., vi., 10.

poor, by setting on foot and keeping up many things which it sees to be efficacious in the relief of poverty. Here again it has always succeeded so well that it has even extorted the praise of its enemies. Such was the ardor of brotherly love among the earliest Christians that numbers of those who were better off deprived themselves of their possessions in order to relieve their brethren; whence *neither was there any one needy among them.*[1] To the order of Deacons, instituted for that very purpose, was committed by the Apostles the charge of the daily distributions; and the Apostle Paul, though burdened with the solicitude of all the churches, hesitated not to undertake laborious journeys in order to carry the alms of the Faithful to the poorer Christians. Tertullian calls these contributions, given voluntarily by Christians in their assemblies, *deposits of piety;* because to cite his words, they were employed *in feeding the needy, in burying them, in the support of boys and girls destitute of means and deprived of their parents, in the care of the aged, and in the relief of the shipwrecked.*[2]

Thus by degrees came into existence the patrimony which the Church has guarded with religious care as the inheritance of the poor. Nay, to spare them the shame of begging, the common Mother of rich and poor has exerted herself to gather together funds for the support of the needy. The Church has stirred up everywhere the heroism of charity, and has established Congregations of Religious and many other useful institutions for help and mercy, so that there might be hardly any kind of suffering which was not visited and relieved. At the present day there are many who, like the heathen of old, blame and condemn the Church for this beautiful charity. They would substitute in its place a system of State-organized relief. But no human methods will ever supply for the devotion and self-sacrifice of Chistian charity. Charity, as a virtue, belongs to the Church; for it is no virtue unless it is drawn from the Sacred Heart of Jesus Christ; and he who turns his back on the Church cannot be near to Christ.

It cannot, however, be doubted that to attain the purpose of which We treat, not only the Church, but all human means must conspire. All who are concerned in the matter must be of one mind and must act together. It is in this, as in the Providence which governs the world; results do not happen save where all the causes co-operate.

Let us now, therefore, inquire what part the State should play in the work of remedy and relief.

By the State, we here understand, not the particular form of government which prevails in this or that nation, but the State as

---

[1] Acts iv., 34.

[2] *Apologia Secunda*, xxxix.

rightly understood; that is to say, any government conformable in its institutions to right reason and natural law, and to those dictates of the Divine Wisdom which We have expounded in the Encyclical on the Christian Constitution of the State. The first duty, therefore, of the rulers of the State should be to make sure that the laws and institutions, the general character and administration of the commonwealth, shall be such as to produce of themselves public well-being and private prosperity. This is the proper office of wise statesmanship and the work of the heads of the State. Now a State chiefly prospers and flourishes by morality, by well-regulated family life, by respect for religion and justice, by the moderation and equal distribution of public burdens, by the progress of the arts and of trade, by the abundant yield of the land—by everything which makes the citizens better and happier. Here, then, it is in the power of a ruler to benefit every order of the State, and amongst the rest to promote in the highest degree the interests of the poor; and this by virtue of his office, and without being exposed to any suspicion of undue interference —for it is the province of the commonwealth to consult for the common good. And the more that is done for the working population by the general laws of the country, the less need will there be to seek for particular means to relieve them.

There is another and a deeper consideration which must not be lost sight of. To the State the interests of all are equal, whether high or low. The poor are members of the national community equally with the rich; they are real component parts, living parts, which make up, through the family, the living body; and it need hardly be said that they are by far the majority. It would be irrational to neglect one portion of the citizens and to favor another; and therefore the public administration must duly and solicitously provide for the welfare and the comfort of the working people, or else that law of justice will be violated which ordains that each shall have his due. To cite the wise words of St. Thomas of Aquin: *As the part and the whole are in a certain sense identical the part may in some sense claim what belongs to the whole.*[1] Among the many and grave duties of rulers who would do their best for the people, the first and chief is to act with strict justice—with that justice which is called in the Schools *distributive*—towards each and every class.

But although all citizens, without exception, can and ought to contribute to that common good in which individuals share so profitably to themselves, yet it is not to be supposed that all can contribute in the same way and to the same extent. No matter

[1] 2a 2ae Q. LXI. Art. 1 ad 2.

what changes may be made in forms of government, there will always be differences and inequalities of condition in the State: Society cannot exist or be conceived without them. Some there must be who dedicate themselves to the work of the commonwealth, who make the laws, who administer justice, whose advice and authority govern the nation in times of peace, and defend it in war. Such men clearly occupy the foremost place in the State, and should be held in the foremost estimation, for their work touches most nearly and effectively the general interests of the community. Those who labor at a trade or calling do not promote the general welfare in such a fashion as this; but they do in the most important way benefit the nation, though less directly. We have insisted that, since it is the end of Society to make men better, the chief good that Society can be possessed of is Virtue. Nevertheless, in all well-constituted States it is a by no means unimportant matter to provide those bodily and external commodities, *the use of which is necessary to virtuous action.*[1] And in the provision of material well-being, the labor of the poor—the exercise of their skill and the employment of their strength in the culture of the land and the workshops of trade—is most efficacious and altogether indispensable. Indeed, their co-operation in this respect is so important that it may be truly said that it is only by the labor of the working man that States grow rich. Justice, therefore, demands that the interests of the poorer population be carefully watched over by the Administration, so that they who contribute so largely to the advantage of the community may themselves share in the benefits they create—that being housed, clothed, and enabled to support life, they may find their existence less hard and more endurable. It follows that whatever shall appear to be conducive to the well-being of those who work, should receive favorable consideration. Let it not be feared that solicitude of this kind will injure any interest; on the contrary, it will be to the advantage of all; for it cannot but be good for the commonwealth to secure from misery those on whom it so largely depends.

We have said that the State must not absorb the individual or the family; both should be allowed free and untrammelled action as far as is consistent with the common good and the interests of others. Nevertheless, rulers should anxiously safeguard the community and all its parts; the community, because the conservation of the community is so emphatically the business of the supreme power, that the safety of the commonwealth is not only the first law, but it is a Government's whole reason of existence; and the

[1] St. Thomas of Aquin. *De Regimine Principum*, I. cap. 15.

parts, because both philosophy and the Gospel agree in laying down that the object of the administration of the State should be, not the advantage of the ruler, but the benefit of those over whom he rules. The gift of authority is from God, and is, as it were, a participation of the highest of all sovereignties; and it should be exercised as the power of God is exercised—with a fatherly solicitude which not only guides the whole, but reaches to details as well.

Whenever the general interest of any particular class suffers, or is threatened with evils which can in no other way be met, the public authority must step in to meet them. Now, among the interests of the public, as of private individuals, are these: that peace and good order should be maintained; that family life should be carried on in accordance with God's laws and those of nature; that Religion should be reverenced and obeyed; that a high standard of morality should prevail in public and private life; that the sanctity of justice should be respected, and that no one should injure another with impunity; that the members of the commonwealth should grow up to man's estate strong and robust, and capable, if need be, of guarding and defending their country. If by a strike or other combination of workmen, there should be imminent danger of disturbance to the public peace; or if circumstances were such that among the laboring population the ties of family life were relaxed; if Religion were found to suffer through the workmen not having time and opportunity to practice it; if in workshops and factories there were danger to morals through the mixing of the sexes or from any occasion of evil; or if employers laid burdens upon the workmen which were unjust, or degraded them with conditions that were repugnant to their dignity as human beings; finally, if health were endangered by excessive labor, or by work unsuited to sex or age—in these cases there can be no question that, within certain limits, it would be right to call in the help and authority of the law. The limits must be determined by the nature of the occasion which calls for the law's interference—the principle being this, that the law must not undertake more, or go farther, than is required for the remedy of the evil or the removal of the danger.

Rights must be religiously respected wherever they are found; and it is the duty of the public authority to prevent and punish injury, and to protect each one in the possession of his own. Still, when there is question of protecting the rights of individuals, the poor and helpless have a claim to special consideration. The richer population have many ways of protecting themselves, and stand less in need of help from the State; those who are badly off have no resources of their own to fall back upon, and must chiefly

rely upon the assistance of the State. And it is for this reason that wage-earners, who are undoubtedly among the weak and necessitous, should be specially cared for and protected by the commonwealth. Here, however, it will be advisable to advert expressly to one or two of the more important details. It must be borne in mind that the chief thing to be secured is the safe-guarding, by legal enactment and policy, of private property. Most of all is it essential in these times of covetous greed, to keep the multitude within the line of duty; for if all may justly strive to better their condition, yet neither justice nor the common good allows any one to seize that which belongs to another, or, under the pretext of futile and ridiculous equality, to lay hands on other people's fortunes. It is most true, that by far the larger part of the people who work prefer to improve themselves by honest labor rather than by doing wrong to others. But there are not a few who are imbued with bad principles and are anxious for revolutionary change, and whose great purpose it is to stir up tumult and bring about a policy of violence. The authority of the State should intervene to put restraint upon these disturbers, to save the workmen from their seditious arts, and to protect lawful owners from spoliation.

When work-people have recourse to a strike, it is frequently because the hours of labor are too long, or the work too hard, or because they consider their wages insufficient. The grave inconvenience of this not uncommon occurrence should be obviated by public remedial measures; for such paralysis of labor not only affects the masters and their work-people, but is extremely injurious to trade, and to the general interests of the public; moreover, on such occasions, violence and disorder are generally not far off. and thus it frequently happens that the public peace is threatened. The laws should be beforehand, and prevent these troubles from arising; they should lend their influence and authority to the removal in good time of the causes which lead to conflicts between masters and those whom they employ.

But if the owners of property must be made secure, the workman, too, has property and possessions in which he must be protected; and, first of all, there are his spiritual and mental interests. Life on earth, however good and desirable in itself, is not the final purpose for which man is created; it is only the way and the means to that attainment of truth, and that practice of goodness, in which the full life of the soul consists. It is the soul which is made after the image and likeness of God; it is in the soul that sovereignty resides, in virtue of which man is commanded to rule the creatures below him, and to use all the earth and the ocean for his profit and advantage. *Fill the earth and subdue it; and rule*

over the fishes of the sea, and the fowls of the air, and all living creatures which move upon the earth.[1] In this respect all men are equal; there is no difference between rich and poor, master and servant, ruler and ruled, *for the same is Lord over all.*[2] No man may outrage with impunity that human dignity which God Himself treats *with reverence*, nor stand in the way of that higher life which is the preparation for the eternal life of Heaven. Nay, more; a man has here no power over himself. To consent to any treatment which is calculated to defeat the end and purpose of his being is beyond his right; he cannot give up his soul to servitude, for it is not man's own rights which are here in question, but th rights of God, most sacred and inviolable.

From this follows the obligation of the cessation of work and labor on Sundays and certain festivals. This rest from labor is not to be understood as mere idleness; much less must it be an occasion of spending money and of vicious excess, as many would desire it to be, but it should be rest from labor consecrated by religion. Repose united with religious observance disposes man to forget for a while the business of this daily life, and to turn his thoughts to heavenly things and to the worship which he so strictly owes to the Eternal Deity. It is this, above all, which is the reason and motive of the Sunday rest; a rest sanctioned by God's great law of the ancient covenant: *Remember thou keep holy the Sabbath Day*,[3] and taught to the world by His own mysterious "rest" after the creation of man; *He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had done.*[4]

If we now turn to things exterior and corporeal, the first concern of all is to save the poor workers from the cruelty of grasping speculators, who use human beings as mere instruments for making money. It is neither justice nor humanity so to grind men down with excessive labor as to stupefy their minds and wear out their bodies. Man's powers, like his general nature, are limited, and beyond these limits he cannot go. His strength is developed and increased by use and exercise, but only on condition of due intermission and proper rest. Daily labor, therefore, must be so regulated that it may not be protracted during longer hours than strength admits. How many and how long the intervals of rest should be, will depend on the nature of the work, on circumstances of time and place, and on the health and strength of the workman. Those who labor in mines and quarries, and in work within the bowels of the earth, should have shorter hours in proportion as their labor is more severe and more trying to health.

---

[1] Genesis i., 28.
[2] Romans x., 12.
[3] Exod. xx., 8.
[4] Genesis ii., 2.

Then again, the season of the year must be taken into account; for not unfrequently a kind of labor is easy at one time which at another is intolerable or very difficult. Finally, work which is suitable for a strong man cannot reasonably be required from a woman or a child. And, in regard to children, great care should be taken not to place them in workshops and factories until their bodies and minds are sufficiently mature. For just as rough weather destroys the buds of spring, so too early an experience of life's hard work blights the young promise of a child's powers, and makes any real education impossible. Women, again, are not suited to certain trades; for a woman is by nature fitted for home-work, and it is that which is best adapted at once to preserve her modesty and to promote the good bringing up of children and the well-being of the family. As a general principle it may be laid down, that a workman ought to have leisure and rest in proportion to the wear and tear of his strength; for the waste of strength must be repaired by the cessation of work.

In all agreements between masters and work-people, there is always the condition, expressed or understood, that there be allowed proper rest for soul and body. To agree in any other sense would be against what is right and just; for it can never be right or just to require on the one side, or to promise on the other, the giving up of those duties which a man owes to his God and to himself.

We now approach a subject of very great importance, and one on which, if extremes are to be avoided, right ideas are absolutely necessary. Wages, we are told, are fixed by free consent; and therefore the employer, when he pays what was agreed upon, has done his part and is not called upon for anything further. The only way, it is said, in which injustice could happen would be if the master refused to pay the whole of the wages, or the workman would not complete the work undertaken; when this happens the State should intervene, to see that each obtains his own—but not under any other circumstances.

This mode of reasoning is by no means convincing to a fair-minded man, for there are important considerations which it leaves out of view altogether. To labor is to exert one's self for the sake of procuring what is necessary for the purposes of life, and most of all for self-preservation. *In the sweat of thy brow thou shalt eat bread.*[1] Therefore a man's labor has two notes or characters. First of all, it is *personal;* for the exertion of individual power belongs to the individual who puts it forth, employing this power for that personal profit for which it was given. Secondly, man's labor is *necessary;* for without the results of labor a man cannot live; and

[1] Genesis iii., 19.

self-conservation is a law of Nature, which it is wrong to disobey. Now if we were to consider labor merely so far as it is *personal*, doubtless it would be within the workman's right to accept any rate of wages whatever; for in the same way as he is free to work or not, so he is free to accept a small remuneration or even none at all. But this is a mere abstract supposition; the labor of the working man is not only his personal attribute, but it is *necessary;* and this makes all the difference. The preservation of life is the bounden duty of each and all, and to fail therein is a crime. It follows that each one has a right to procure what is required in order to live; and the poor can procure it in no other way than by work and wages.

Let it be granted, then, that, as a rule, workman and employer, should make free agreements, and in particular should freely agree as to wages; nevertheless, there is a dictate of nature more imperious and more ancient than any bargain between man and man, that the remuneration must be enough to support the wage-earner in reasonable and frugal comfort. If through necessity or fear of a worse evil, the workman accepts harder conditions because an employer or a contractor will give him no better, he is the victim of force and injustice. In these and similar questions, however—such as, for example, the hours of labor in different trades, the sanitary precautions to be observed in factories and workshops, etc.—in order to supersede undue interference on the part of the State, especially as circumstances, times, and localities differ so widely, it is advisable that recourse be had to Societies or Boards such as We shall mention presently, or to some other method of safe-guarding the interests of wage-earners; the State to be asked for approval and protection.

If a workman's wages be sufficient to enable him to maintain himself, his wife, and his children in reasonable comfort, he will not find it difficult, if he is a sensible man, to study economy; and he will not fail, by cutting down expenses, to put by a little property; nature and reason would urge him to this. We have seen that this great labor question cannot be solved except by assuming as a principle that private ownership must be held sacred and inviolable. The law, therefore, should favor ownership, and its policy should be to induce as many of the people as possible to become owners.

Many excellent results will follow from this; and first of all, property will certainly become more equitably divided. For the effect of civil change and revolution has been to divide society into two widely different castes. On the one side there is the party which holds the power because it holds the wealth; which has in its grasp all labor and all trade, which manipulates for its

own benefit and its own purposes all the sources of supply, and which is powerfully represented in the councils of the State itself. On the other side there is the needy and powerless multitude, sore and suffering, and always ready for disturbance. If working people can be encouraged to look forward to obtaining a share in the land, the result will be that the gulf between vast wealth and deep poverty will be bridged over, and the two orders will be brought nearer together. Another consequence will be the greater abundance of the fruits of the earth. Men always work harder and more readily when they work on that which is their own; nay, they learn to love the very soil which yields in response to the labor of their hands, not only food to eat, but an abundance of good things for themselves and those that are dear to them. It is evident how such a spirit of willing labor would add to the produce of the earth and to the wealth of the community. And a third advantage would arise from this: men would cling to the country in which they were born; for no one would exchange his country for a foreign land if his own afforded him the means of living a tolerable and happy life. These three important benefits, however, can only be expected on the condition that a man's means be not drained and exhausted by excessive taxation. The right to possess private property is from nature, not from man; and the State has only the right to regulate its use in the interest of the public good, but by no means to abolish it altogether. The State is therefore unjust and cruel if, in the name of taxation, it deprives the private owner of more than is just.

In the last place—employers and workmen may themselves effect much in the matter of which We treat, by means of those institutions and organizations which afford opportune assistance to those in need, and which draw the two orders more closely together. Among these may be enumerated: Societies for mutual help; various foundations established by private persons for providing for the workman, and for his widow, or his orphans, in sudden calamity, in sickness, and in the event of death; and what are called "patronages" or institutions for the care of boys and girls, for young people and also for those of more mature age.

The most important of all are Workmen's Associations; for these virtually include all the rest. History attests what excellent results were effected by the Artificers' Guilds of a former day. They were the means not only of many advantages to the workmen, but in no small degree of the advancement of art, as numerous monuments remain to prove. Such associations should be adapted to the requirements of the age in which we live—an age of greater instruction, of different customs, and of more numerous requirements in daily life. It is gratifying to know that there are

actually in existence not a few Societies of this nature, consisting either of workmen alone or of workmen and employers together; but it were greatly to be desired that they should multiply and become more effective. We have spoken of them more than once; but it will be well to explain here how much they are needed, to show that they exist by their own right, and to enter into their organization and their work.

The experience of his own weakness urges man to call in help from without. We read in pages of Holy Writ: *It is better that two should be together than one; for they have the advantage of their society. If one fall he shall be supported by the other. Woe to him that is alone, for when he falleth he hath none to lift him up.* And further: *A brother that is helped by his brother is like a strong city.*[2] It is this natural impulse which unites men in civil society; and it is this also which makes them band themselves together in association of citizen with citizen; associations which, it is true, cannot be called societies in the complete sense of the word, but which are societies nevertheless.

These lesser societies and the society which constitutes the State differ in many things, because their immediate purpose and end is different. Civil society exists for the common good, and therefore is concerned with the interests of all in general, and with individual interests in their due place and proportion. Hence it is called *public* society, because by its means, as St. Thomas of Aquin says, *Men communicate with one another in the setting up of a commonwealth.*[3] But the societies which are formed in the bosom of the State are called *private*, and justly so, because their immediate purpose is the private advantage of the associates. *Now a private society*, says St. Thomas again, *is one which is formed for the purpose of carrying out private business; as when two or three enter into a partnership with the view of trading in conjunction.*[4] Particular societies, then, although they exist within the State, and are each a part of the State, nevertheless cannot be prohibited by the State absolutely and as such. For to enter into "society" of this kind is the natural right of man; and the State must protect natural rights, not destroy them; and if it forbids its citizens to form associations, it contradicts the very principle of its own existence; for both they and it exist in virtue of the same principle, viz., the natural propensity of man to live in society.

There are times, no doubt, when it is right that the law should interfere to prevent association; as when men join together for

---

[1] Ecclesiastes iv., 9, 10. [2] Proverbs xviii., 19.
[3] *Contra impugnantes Dei cultum et religionem*, Cap. II. [4] *Ibid.*

purposes which are evidently bad, unjust, or dangerous to the State. In such cases the public authority may justly forbid the formation of associations, and may dissolve them when they already exist. But every precaution should be taken not to violate the rights of individuals and not to make unreasonable regulations under the pretence of public benefit. For laws only bind when they are in accordance with right reason, and therefore with the eternal law of God.[1]

And here we are reminded of the Confraternities, Societies, and Religious Orders, which have arisen by the Church's authority and the piety of the Christian people. The annals of every nation down to our own times testify to what they have done for the human race. It is indisputable, on grounds of reason alone, that such associations, being perfectly blameless in their objects, have the sanction of the law of nature. On their religious side, they rightly claim to be responsible to the Church alone. The administrators of the State, therefore, have no rights over them, nor can they claim any share in their management; on the contrary, it is the State's duty to respect and cherish them, and, if necessary, to defend them from attack. It is notorious that a very different course has been followed, more especially in our own times. In many places the State has laid violent hands on these Communities, and committed manifold injustice against them; it has placed them under the civil law, taken away their rights as corporate bodies, and robbed them of their property. In such property the Church had her rights, each member of the body had his or her rights, and there were also the rights of those who had founded or endowed them for a definite purpose, and of those for whose benefit and assistance they existed. Wherefore We cannot refrain from complaining of such spoliation as unjust and fraught with evil results; and with the more reason because, at the very time when the law proclaims that association is free to all, We see that Catholic societies, however peaceable and useful, are hindered in every way, whilst the utmost freedom is given to men whose objects are at once hurtful to Religion and dangerous to the State.

Associations of every kind, and especially those of working men, are now far more common than formerly. In regard to many of these there is no need at present to inquire whence they spring, what are their objects, or what means they use. But there is a good deal of evidence which goes to prove that many of these societies are in the hands of invisible leaders, and are managed on principles

[1] *Human law is law only in virtue of its accordance with right reason; and thus it is manifest that it flows from the eternal law. And in so far as it deviates from right reason it is called an unjust law; in such case it is not law at all, but rather a species of violence.*—St. Thomas of Aquin, *Summa Theologica*, 1a 2æ Q. xciii. Art. iii.

far from compatible with Christianity and the public well-being; and that they do their best to get into their hands the whole field of labor, and to force workmen either to join them or to starve. Under these circumstances Christian workmen must do one of two things; either join associations in which their religion will be exposed to peril, or form associations among themselves—unite their forces and courageously shake off the yoke of an unjust and intolerable oppression. No one who does not wish to expose man's chief good to extreme danger will hesitate to say that the second alternative must by all means be adopted.

Those Catholics are worthy of all praise—and there are not a few—who, understanding what the times require, have, by various enterprises and experiments, endeavored to better the condition of the working people without any sacrifice of principle. They have taken up the cause of the working man, and have striven to make both families and individuals better off; to infuse the spirit of justice into the mutual relation of employer and employed; to keep before the eyes of both classes the precepts of duty and the laws of the Gospel—that Gospel which, by inculcating self-restraint, keeps men within the bounds of moderation, and tends to establish harmony among the divergent interests and various classes which compose the State. It is with such ends in view that We see men of eminence meeting together for discussion, for the promotion of united action, and for practical work. Others, again, strive to unite working people of various kinds into associations, help them with their advice and their means, and enable them to obtain honest and profitable work. The Bishops, on their part, bestow their ready good-will and support; and with their approval and guidance many members of the clergy, both secular and regular, labor assiduously on behalf of the spiritual and mental interests of the members of Associations. And there are not wanting Catholics possessed of affluence, who have, as it were, cast in their lot with the wage-earners, and who have spent large sums in founding and widely spreading Benefit and Insurance Societies, by means of which the working man may without difficulty acquire by his labor not only many present advantages, but also the certainty of honorable support in time to come. How much this multiplied and earnest activity has benefited the community at large is too well known to require Us to dwell upon it. We find in it the grounds of the most cheering hope for the future; provided that the associations we have described continue to grow and spread, and are well and wisely administered. Let the State watch over these societies of citizens united together in the exercise of their right; but let it not thrust itself into their peculiar concerns and their organization; for things move and live by the

soul within them, and they may be killed by the grasp of a hand from without.

In order that an association may be carried on with unity of purpose and harmony of action, its organization and government must be firm and wise. All such societies, being free to exist, have the further right to adopt such rules and organization as may best conduce to the attainment of their objects. We do not deem it possible to enter into definite details on the subject of organization: this must depend on national character, on practice and experience, on the nature and scope of the work to be done, on the magnitude of the various trades and employments, and on other circumstances of fact and of time—all of which must be carefully weighed.

Speaking summarily, we may lay it down as a general and perpetual law, that workmen's associations should be so organized and governed as to furnish the best and most suitable means for attaining what is aimed at, that is to say for helping each individual member to better his condition to the utmost in body, mind, and property. It is clear that they must pay special and principal attention to piety and morality, and that their internal discipline must be directed precisely by these considerations; otherwise they entirely lose their special character, and come to be very little better than those societies which take no account of Religion at all What advantage can it be to a Workman to obtain by means of a Society all that he requires, and to endanger his soul for want of spiritual food? *What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his own soul?*[1] This, as our Lord teaches, is the note or character that distinguishes the Christian from the heathen. *After all these things do the heathens seek. . . . Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His justice, and all these things shall be added unto you.*[2] Let our associations, then, look first and before all to God; let religious instruction have therein a foremost place, each one being carefully taught what is his duty to God, what to believe, what to hope for, and how to work out his salvation; and let all be warned and fortified with especial solicitude against wrong opinions and false teaching. Let the working man be urged and led to the worship of God, to the earnest practice of religion, and, among other things, to the sanctification of Sundays and festivals. Let him learn to reverence and love Holy Church, the common mother of us all; and so to obey the precepts and to frequent the sacraments of the church, those sacraments being the means ordained by God for obtaining forgiveness of sin and for leading a holy life.

---

[1] St. Matthew, xvi., 26.

[2] St. Matthew, vi., 32, 33.

The foundations of the organization being laid in religion we next go on to determine the relations of the members one to another, in order that they may live together in concord and go on prosperously and successfully. The offices and charges of the society should be distributed for the good of the society itself, and in such manner that difference in degree or position should not interfere with unanimity and good-will. Office-bearers should be appointed with prudence and discretion, and each one's charge should be carefully marked out; thus no member will suffer wrong. Let the common funds be administered with the strictest honesty, in such way that a member receive assistance in proportion to his necessities. The rights and duties of employers should be the subject of careful consideration as compared with the rights and duties of the employed. If it should happen that either a master or a workman deemed himself injured, nothing would be more desirable than that there should be a committee composed of honest and capable men of the Association itself, whose duty it should be, by the laws of the Association, to decide the dispute. Among the purposes of a Society should be to try to arrange for a continuous supply of work at all times and seasons; and to create a fund from which the members may be helped in their necessities, not only in case of accident, but also in sickness, old age, and misfortune.

Such rules and regulations, if obeyed willingly by all, will sufficiently ensure the well-being of poor people; whilst such Mutual Associations among Catholics are certain to be productive, in no small degree, of prosperity to the State. It is not rash to conjecture the future from the past. Age gives way to age, but the events of one century are wonderfully like those of another; for they are directed by the Providence of God, Who overrules the course of history in accordance with His purposes in creating the race of man. We are told that it was cast as a reproach on the Christians of the early ages of the Church, that the greater number of them had to live by begging or by labor. Yet, destitute as they were of wealth and influence, they ended by winning over to their side the favor of the rich and the good-will of the powerful. They showed themselves industrious, laborious, and peaceful, men of justice, and, above all, men of brotherly love. In the presence of such a life and such an example, prejudice disappeared, the tongue of malevolence was silenced, and the lying traditions of ancient superstition yielded little by little to Christian truth.

At this moment the condition of the working population is the question of the hour; and nothing can be of higher interest to all classes of the State than that it should be rightly and reasonably decided. But it will be easy for Christian working men to decide

it aright if they form Associations, choose wise guides, and follow the same path which with so much advantage to themselves and the commonwealth was trod by their fathers before them. Prejudice, it is true, is mighty, and so is the love of money; but if the sense of what is just and right be not destroyed by depravity of heart, their fellow-citizens are sure to be won over to a kindly feeling towards men whom they see to be so industrious and so modest, who so unmistakably prefer honesty to lucre, and the sacredness of duty to all other considerations.

And another great advantage would result from the state of things We are describing; there would be so much more hope and possibility of recalling to a sense of their duty those workingmen who have either given up their faith altogether, or whose lives are at variance with its precepts. These men, in most cases, feel that they have been fooled by empty promises and deceived by false appearances. They cannot but perceive that their grasping employers too often treat them with the greatest inhumanity and hardly care for them beyond the profit their labor brings; and if they belong to an Association, it is probably one in which there exists, in place of charity and love, that intestine strife which always accompanies unresigned and irreligious poverty. Broken in spirit and worn down in body, how many of them would gladly free themselves from this galling slavery! But human respect, or the dread of starvation, makes them afraid to take the step. To such as these, Catholic Associations are of incalculable service, helping them out of their difficulties, inviting them to companionship, and receiving the repentant to a shelter in which they may securely trust.

We have now laid before you, Venerable Brethren, who are the persons, and what are the means, by which this most difficult question must be solved. Every one must put his hand to the work which falls to his share, and that at once and immediately, lest the evil which is already so great may by delay become absolutely beyond remedy. Those who rule the State must use the law and the institutions of the country; masters and rich men must remember their duty; the poor, whose interests are at stake, must make every lawful and proper effort; and since Religion alone, as We said at the beginning, can destroy the evil at its root, all men must be persuaded that the primary thing needful is to return to real Christianity, in the absence of which all the plans and devices of the wisest will be of little avail.

As far as regards the Church, its assistance will never be wanting, be the time or the occasion what it may; and it will intervene with the greater effect in proportion as its liberty of action is the

more unfettered: let this be carefully noted by those whose office it is to provide for the public welfare. Every minister of holy Religion must throw into the conflict all the energy of his mind and all the strength of his endurance. With your authority, Venerable Brethren, and by your example, they must never cease to urge upon all men of every class, upon the high as well as the lowly, the Gospel doctrines of Christian life; by every means in their power they must strive for the good of the people; and above all they must earnestly cherish in themselves, and try to arouse in others, Charity, the mistress and queen of virtues. For the happy results we all long for must be chiefly brought about by the plenteous outpouring of Charity; of that true Christian Charity which is the fulfilling of the whole Gospel law, which is always ready to sacrifice itself for others' sake, and which is man's surest antidote against worldly pride and immoderate love of self; that Charity, whose office is described and whose Godlike features are drawn by the Apostle St. Paul in these words: *Charity is patient, is kind . . seeketh not her own . . . . suffereth all things . . . . endureth all things.*[1]

On each one of you, Venerable Brethren, and your clergy and people, as an earnest of God's mercy and a mark of our affection, We lovingly in the Lord bestow the Apostolic Benediction.

Given at St. Peter's, in Rome, the fifteenth day of May, 1891, the fourteenth year of Our Pontificate.

LEO XIII., POPE.

---

[1] I. Corinthians, xiii., 4-7.

THE PROSPECT FOR IRISH HOME RULE.

THE division among the Irish Home Rulers, which began with Mr. Parnell's removal from the chairmanship of the Parliamentary Party, still continues and much bitterness of feeling has been displayed in the contest. The power of the Irish party in Parliament, which was so conspicuous during the last session, has been almost paralyzed by the schism. Mr. Balfour has been left practically free to mould his Irish Land Act at his discretion, and even in the discussions which have taken place on it, Mr. Parnell has more than once taken sides with the Tory coercionists against the majority of the Irish representatives.

All this is very sad to every well wisher of Ireland, but we must not exaggerate the extent of the evil. The cause of Irish freedom has been seriously endangered, but it is not ruined, and with God's blessing it will not be ruined. Dissensions among the supporters of a great national cause are not peculiar to Ireland. They are the common misfortune of the human race in every land and every age. We need only recall the Paris Commune, with its massacres and wholesale burnings in 1870, the coup d'etat of Louis Napoleon eighteen years before, the revolutions throughout France, Italy and Germany in 1848, the long and ferocious Carlist war in Spain, and our own civil war, not to speak of the struggle now going on in Chili, to convince us that wherever political freedom exists or is ardently desired, there dissensions are likely to occur. It is only in a despotism like Russia or Turkey or in a population indifferent to any national feeling, like the Venetians of the last century, that public opinion exhibits no divisions. The Irish people are undoubtedly warm in their feelings. They possess fully the "ingenium perfervidum Scotorum" which the old Scotch lawyers were accustomed to allow for in their own countrymen, but which was never regarded either in Scotland or England as rendering them incapable of self government. They are, moreover, intensely interested in the struggle for Home Rule, which has been so long going on and is now apparently approaching a successful end. It is no special reproach to the Irish character that a division should occur among Irish nationalists on the question of a leader. It is most regretable, but not at all unnatural under the circumstances, and we believe that the practical sense of the Irish people will bring it to a satisfactory close in time to prevent it from ruining the common cause.

It is only just also to the Irish people to say that the origin of the existing schism lay in circumstances over which they had little or no control, and which were of a kind to bewilder for a time the judgment of any nation at a great crisis in its history. After numerous unsuccessful struggles for self-government continued almost throughout the century under various forms, O'Connell's repeal agitation, the young Ireland physical force policy, James Stephen's Fenian organization, Isaac Butt's Home Rule party, and other lesser movements, a leader and a policy had at length appeared which fairly promised to attain the much desired object. Mr. Parnell and a few colleagues, among whom should be remembered Joseph Biggar and John Dillon, as well as one prematurely deceased, Joseph Ronayne, took up the Home Rule programme of Mr. Butt at a time when it seemed to be dying of inanition. Mr. Butt and others, it may be remembered, had commenced a struggle for the repeal of the Union on Parliamentary lines after the collapse of the Fenian attempt at armed insurrection. Butt, a man of remarkable talents but weak character, tried for some years to obtain Home Rule for Ireland by simple argument with the English ministers. He failed completely. Both Tories and Liberals pronounced against any restoration of the Irish Parliament, and the Irish people while feeling the absolute necessity of such a measure, began to believe it impossible of attainment by Parliamentary action.

It was at this moment that Biggar and Parnell, without separating themselves from the Irish party, inaugurated the policy of Parliamentary obstruction in place of appeals to ministerial justice. Their action won almost immediate approval in Ireland. Mr. Butt died, and was at first succeeded by Mr. Shaw, a somewhat colorless politician of respectable private character, but moderate talent. In two elections the Irish voters rallied to Parnell, and finally made him the leader of a united Irish parliamentary party of eighty-five members, all united in a vigorous policy of obstruction of English Governments until the just claims of Ireland should be conceded. The Irish members quickly showed the power which they possessed by dispossessing first a Liberal and then a Tory ministry in quick succession. Mr. Gladstone, the leader of the English Liberals, frankly accepted the situation and brought forward a measure for giving Ireland a domestic Parliament in 1886. He failed then to carry with him the whole of his own party, owing mainly to the opposition of a section since known as Liberal Unionists, led by Lord Hartington and Mr. Joseph Chamberlain. Mr. Gladstone proved that he was sincere in his advocacy of Irish Home Rule by dissolving Parliament on that question. Though the election of 1886 left the Liberal supporters of Home Rule in a minority

in England, the gain was an enormous one for Ireland. Since that time everything has indicated that public opinion in England has changed enormously in favor of Irish self-government, and a few months ago it was generally looked on as a thing to be won inevitably at the next general election. That the Irish cause had made such an advance from the days when Isaac Butt could hardly get a hearing for his plea in favor of Home Rule was felt to be due mainly to Parnell's skill and honesty. It is little cause for wonder that he was politically the idol of the Irish people for the last eight years.

The attempt of the London *Times* to ruin his character by the Pigott forgeries and its utter failure, materially added to Mr. Parnell's reputation both in England and Ireland. During over a year his private as well as his public life had been submitted to the closest scrutiny by a tribunal of political foes. The whole machinery of the Irish Government had been placed at the service of the *Times* in its efforts to blacken the Irish leader's reputation and yet the attempt to do so had only recoiled on its authors. The most specious charges had been refuted with overwhelming evidence of their falsehood and that too before a hostile commission. Parnell in the eyes of the public was not only one of the ablest statesmen of his time but he was also a Bayard "without fear or reproach." Rumors of other charges to be brought against his moral character were heard but they were treated with scorn by men of all parties and indignantly denied by himself. It can safely be said that in the autumn of last year Mr. Parnell's reputation stood amongst the highest prominent in public life in the British Empire.

Such was the condition of affairs when the O'Shea divorce trial came like a thunder-clap on both the Irish and the English public. It was with a feeling of stupor that men heard that the trusted leader of the Irish people had no defence to offer to a charge of gross immorality and breach of faith to a friend whose hospitality he had abused. At first the Irish people refused to believe it, but in some days Mr. Parnell's continued silence made it impossible to doubt of his guilt.

What course should be adopted by the Irish people and their representatives in so unexpected a conjuncture was a most difficult question. The cause of Home Rule was everywhere advancing throughout the British Empire and the recent vindication of the Irish leader by the special commission was a very important factor in the change of English public opinion. On English opinion at the next election will depend the immediate triumph of Home Rule or its postponement, it may be, for several years. It was therefore necessary for the Irish representatives if they would

faithfully discharge the trust laid on them of protecting the interests of Ireland to ascertain how Mr. Parnell's moral disgrace would be received in England. It was also necessary for them to decide how far it would be practical to dispense with his known political abilities at such a crisis of the nation's fate. Among the Irish people the abhorrence felt for the particular crime with which their leader was charged is probably stronger than in any other part of the world. The reverence which a month before had surrounded Mr. Parnell was gone forever, and at best was only replaced by a feeling of deep pity for his fall. But would it be possible, men asked themselves, to dispense with his public services without ruining the national cause, and if such were the case did the interests of public morality absolutely require they should be dispensed with? All these questions were full of difficulties, both moral and political, and it is little wonder that they should for a time have bewildered and divided public opinion in Ireland. We shall deal with them at length a little later in order not to interrupt the current of events here. The Irish representatives at the opening of the session concluded to re-elect Mr. Parnell as chairman, and leave it to himself to resign the office. This course the majority believed he would adopt and they desired as a last tribute to his services to make his fall as easy as might be. We believe they were guilty of an error in doing so, but it is one which under all the circumstances may fairly be excused.

The consequences of this step were quickly make apparent. Mr. Gladstone as leader of the English party committed to the establishment of Home Rule advised the Irish representatives that in the existing condition of public opinion in England he believed Mr. Parnell's retention as Irish leader would mean a defeat at the next election for their English allies. Almost at the same time the Irish Catholic Bishops published a circular protesting against the scandal of retaining Parnell as leader. The Irish members decided to reconsider their hasty action, and a meeting presided over by Mr. Parnell was convened in one of the committee rooms of the Parliament House. Mr. Parnell was then urged to resign but he absolutely refused. A somewhat prolonged and stormy debate followed and finally as the chairman refused to put the motion for his own deposition, the majority of the members retired from the meeting and assembled in another place where they passed a vote removing Parnell from the leadership and electing Mr. Justin McCarthy, the vice-chairman of the party in the past session as chairman. Mr. Parnell refused to submit to the majority and appealed from them to the public voice of Ireland. An election happened to be pending in North Kilkenny, and a candidate had been selected already by the Nationalist party including Parnell

himself. The candidate thus chosen was Sir John Pope Hennessey, the late Governor of the Island of Mauritius, where he had established a Home Rule Government, which gained him great popularity with the French Creole population. As he declined to take sides with Mr. Parnell, however, the latter immediately selected an opposition candidate in the person of a Mr. Scully, a gentleman of considerable landed property in Tipperary. The contest in Kilkenny was stubbornly fought, but at the election, Hennessey was returned by a large majority. Parnell at the beginning of the session had publicly announced that he would leave the question of his retirement absolutely at the will of the Irish people and that he would retire if there were even any danger of serious dissension on the question. This declaration he now wholly ignored. He refused to accept the decision of the majority of the Irish members; he also refused to accept the verdict of the voters of Kilkenny. The first he declared was the work of Gladstone, the latter of the Irish priesthood, and he declared his determination to force a contest on his claim to the leadership in every constituency in Ireland. The result has been the division of the Irish people into two parties, both proclaiming that their object is to obtain self-government for their native land but differing on the choice of means to that end. The minority claim that Parnell is the only man that can lead the Irish race successfully to the attainment of the desired object. The majority hold that he has forfeited his claim to public confidence and that his continuance as leader would be fatal to any hope of success from the English friends of Home Rule. This purely personal question is the only one which divides the Irish Nationalists at the present moment and we do not believe that the division will be a prolonged one. That it should have occurred under the circumstances was almost inevitable, but its continuance would be political lunacy. We believe that the good sense of the majority of the Irish people will soon recognize the true principles on which the conflicting opinions can be reconciled in the common cause of all.

To ascertain those principles we shall briefly give the arguments used on both sides, with as much impartiality as possible. Mr. Parnell and his Parliamentary adherents urge that he is the ablest politician to-day in Irish public life and that though his moral character is sullied, his honesty in Irish politics need not be doubted in view of his past services. They urge that the establishment of a satisfactory form of Home Rule in Ireland, even supposing that the English people and Government should grant it, in general principle will be a task requiring the ablest statesmanship as well as the highest personal integrity on the part of the leaders. It is pointed out with justice that a nominal Irish Parliament might be

so crippled by restrictions as to leave it incapable of discharging its functions and Mr. Parnell since his break with the majority of his party declares that the Home Rule measure intended by Mr. Gladstone would be of such a kind. On these grounds the Parnellites claim that Parnell is absolutely necessary as a leader of the Irish people at present and that without his guidance Home Rule will never be attained. As to the scandal of his personal conduct they urge, that in other countries men of depraved characters in private, have frequently been trusted with high public office. And finally they say that politics have nothing to do with private morals. The breaking of the unity of the Parliamentary Party which has for several years been recognized as the legitimate ruling body of the Nationalists, Mr. Parnell's followers justify on the ground that Parnell is absolutely indispensable to the Irish cause and that any attempt to dispense with his leadership is treason to Ireland. In their eyes Mr. Parnell is actually the Irish nation, just as Louis the Fourteenth was himself the State to loyal Frenchmen two hundred years ago. The Irish Nationalists who refuse to accept his leadership are simply " seceders " in Mr. Parnell's view, whatever be their numbers or character. It is his task, as he informed the Irishmen of this country in his manifesto a few months ago, to expel all such rotten members from the ranks of Irish Nationalists and to see that in the future none shall have influence in the Irish National movement except those whose loyalty to himself is unquestioned.

We fully admit that it will need all the abilities of the leaders of the Irish people to make sure that the Home Rule constitution, which Mr. Gladstone's party proposes to establish, be adequate to the wants of the Irish people. Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Morley we believe to be perfectly honest in their wish to give Ireland a system of government which will be satisfactory to the Irish people, but English prejudices will still be strong, and we fully expect to see attempts made to restrict unduly the right of the Irish people to manage their own affairs, even should a Home Rule Parliament have power at Westminister. We do not, however, at all believe that Mr. Parnell's leadership is essential to securing a satisfactory measure. The Irish people are not so destitute of political ability as to be dependent on a single man, however talented. We fully admit Mr. Parnell's abilities and we cannot but feel grateful for the services he has rendered in the past, but it is simply absurd to suppose that others are not fully capable of protecting the interests of Ireland in the establishment of a national government. On the other hand, Parnell's leadership through his own action against Gladstone, since the divorce case, would imply the end of all direct alliance between the Irish Representatives and the English Liberals. Five years ago Parnell publicly announced to the Irish

people that he was satisfied with the measure proposed by Mr. Gladstone in 1886. He has since steadily endorsed the policy of the latter on every occasion, but as soon as Gladstone found fault with Parnell's own moral shortcomings, he at once contradicted his own previous declarations. We cannot regard with any confidence the guidance of a man who lets his public actions be swayed by his personal grudges. That Mr. Parnell is such a man no sane person will deny in view of his conduct towards Mr. Gladstone. While Gladstone believed him a man of high character, he assured the Irish people that Gladstone's Home Rule measure was all they would need for their own freedom. As soon as Mr. Gladstone declares that Parnell's private guilt is a public scandal, Mr. Parnell at once proclaims that the same Home Rule measure is a fraud on the Irish people. This may be audacity, but it is not the kind of audacity which can make the Irish people trust their fate unreservedly in the hands of Mr. Parnell.

As to the question whether Parnell's moral guilt in the O'Shea case called for his removal from the leadership of the Irish party, we freely admit that no absolute law can be laid down. Men of bad moral character are unfortunately only too often employed in high public office, as Lord Nelson in England, Herbert Bismarck in Germany and Crispi in Italy. There is no moral law which compels us, either individually or in a body, never to employ the services of adulterers or thieves or murderers, provided the ends for which we employ them are themselves righteous. We may employ a lawyer or a doctor whose private character is bad, in case we need his services, and the public may do the same in the case of a general, a diplomatist or most other functionaries. There are, however, two other considerations which occur in the question of such employment. The first is of a moral kind, and relates to the scandal which may be given in particular cases to the public by employing the services of notorious offenders. No Christian can conscientiously employ the services of a public sinner in a case where his employment would be naturally regarded as an endorsement of the offender's sin. To approve, or seem to approve, another's guilt is in itself an offence against morality. The same law holds good in public acts, such as the choice of a leader, as in private ones. Colonel Ingersoll is a distinguished speaker, but it would be wrong with his well-known character as an infidel for Catholics to employ him to champion a Catholic cause. It is not enough not to share his disbelief; it is necessary also not to appear to do so or to make light of it. Such was, we consider, the case in the question of retaining Mr. Parnell as leader, after the exposure in the divorce court. Some time ago a distinguished English statesman had been branded with a similar charge, and public opinion had forced him to retire from political life. Could the Catholic

people of Ireland show less sensitiveness of public feeling conscientiously? For ourselves we do not think they could, even though the services of Mr. Parnell were more important to Ireland than those of Sir Charles Dilke to England.

The effect which the scandal was likely to have on English politics is a question entirely distinct from the moral one of scandal. It is of a wholly practical nature and should be regarded as such by those charged with the guidance of Irish politics. In every form of representative government the popularity or unpopularity of a public man must be reckoned with as a matter of strict business. The support of English public opinion, whatever its motives, is an important element for attaining Irish Home Rule to-day. It was a few months ago and is still distinctively favorable to the Irish claims, but on personal grounds it was hostile to Mr. Parnell. Would it be sound statesmanship to risk its loss by uniting the cause of the justly unpopular leader with that of the Irish nation? We do not believe it would, and we believe that no man understood that fact better than Mr. Parnell himself, though he chose to answer the question by denouncing the fickleness of mere public opinion.

The last and most important question in a practical point, has now to be asked. How far would it be prudent for the Irish people to trust their destinies in the hands of one who had shown himself recklessly indifferent to the principles of morality? This is not a question of abstract right; it is simply one of common sense. A conscientious man may without fear of sin trust his cash box to a known thief, but common sense will tell him if he does so he runs much risk of its loss. For the Irish representatives, the question of how far Mr. Parnell could be trusted after the revelation of his moral obliquity was something of the same kind. In the gratification of his passions he had shown himself capable of gross deceit and personal dishonor. Would he be more scrupulous if the interests of the Irish people should differ from his own. The leadership which Mr. Parnell so long exercised and which he now demands as his right is no empty honor. He has had nearly an absolute control of the public policy of the Irish people, and he has declined to submit his administration to any superior authority in the party or out of it. On the occasion of Captain O'Shea's election to Parliament a few years ago, Parnell, as leader of the Irish people, pledged himself surety for his political conduct in the face of very grave doubts on the part of the whole Irish party. Captain O'Shea wholly disregarded the pledges given in his behalf, yet Mr. Parnell never deigned to justify his own conduct or give any reason why he had so rashly pledged himself for a political adventurer.

The subsequent proceedings in the divorce court palpably sug-

gested a motive for his action in that case which is fully as dishonorable as if he had sold the seat for a money bribe. Nevertheless Mr. Parnell has never since uttered a word of explanation of his action, while he calls on the Irish people for an absolute dictatorship over his colleagues and the whole administration of the national movement. Could reasonable men under such circumstances trust him with such an office? It is not a question of ability or of past services but of personal integrity under very strong temptations. Speaking for ourselves, we believe it would be little short of insanity to intrust such a man as Mr. Parnell has shown himself, with the unlimited control of the affairs of Ireland.

We have endeavored to set forth as accurately as we could the views held by the two parties among the Irish Nationalists on the present question. The majority numbering now about fifty-seven out of a total of eighty-five members hold that Mr. Parnell is unfit, for the reasons we have given, to lead the Irish people. Their views as far as can be judged from the two elections held, since the split began, are shared by a similar majority of the Irish voters. While we make full allowance for the motives which actuate the supporters of Mr. Parnell we cannot see any grounds for their rejecting the common principle of representative government, that the majority must rule in disputed questions. The Irish people are united in their demand for a national representative Government, but the followers of Mr. Parnell insist that his temporary dictatorship is first necessary. We think the statement of the case is sufficient to show on which side, right and common sense are arrayed and we believe that the bulk of the followers of Mr. Parnell will soon recognize the fact. It is quite possible that another leader may be chosen than Justin McCarthy, whose age and character hardly fit him for the rough work of political life. Whoever he may be we feel sure he will rally around him the united support of the Irish people.

Were the Irish Nationalists again reunited we see no reason to believe that the Irish Parliament may not be recovered at the next general election. Judging from the local elections in England, Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule policy has a majority of the English voters in its favor at present. It is impossible of course to foretell what may happen in the next few months, but it looks very likely that at the next general election, the Liberals will carry a clear majority of the English constituencies for Irish Home Rule. The Tory ministers themselves are unconsciously or unwillingly promoting the feeling in its favor in England. Mr. Gladstone's favorite argument for removing Irish affairs from the Imperial Parliament, is that they occupy so much of its time that none is left for needed English legislation. Mr. Balfour has helped to convince the public of this by appropriating so

much of the present session to his Irish Land Measure. The Irish representatives, generally speaking, have been too much occupied with the agitation started by Mr. Parnell to devote much time to Parliamentary work, and the best use which the Tories have found for the comparative leisure thus given them has been to employ themselves on Irish legislation, and moreover on Irish legislation of a kind which is alike unpopular in Ireland and in Great Britain. Though peculiar circumstances have kept the Tory Government in power for several years they are naturally the weaker of the two English parties. They are identified with the privileged classes and an aristocratic administration, and since the extension of the franchise, political power in England has been transferred almost absolutely to the unprivileged masses. It is fortunately the stronger party naturally in English politics, which has pronounced in favor of Irish Home Rule. It is almost certain that at the next general election the Liberals will secure a large majority in England which will mean if Mr. Gladstone lives, the grant of self-government to Ireland at least on the lines of his late bill.

It remains for the Irish people themselves to speak at the next election. Should Parnell succeed in carrying the majority of the Irish seats (which is next to an impossibility) he would come into power as the personal enemy of the English leader, which would of course prevent any cordial co-operation between the Irish members and the English ministry in establishing a system of Home Rule. It might be that in consequence the concessions made to Ireland would be cut down to a minimum, and the struggle for self-government would have to be commenced over again. Mr. Parnell has shown that his personal pride is a mastering passion with him and he has expressed himself in peculiarly bitter language towards Mr. Gladstone since the split. It is not unlikely that he will prefer an alliance with the Conservatives should he have a controlling influence in Parliament. This of course would mean an absolute estrangement from the stronger English party, and would at the best delay Home Rule for several years, while it might absolutely prevent its being granted at all, by estranging the whole English democracy. The chance that by skilful and unscrupulous management he would obtain larger concessions for Ireland than another could is to say the least highly improbable, while it is more than likely that he would wholly estrange the sympathy of the English people by such a course.

On the other hand, should the action of the Irish representatives in removing Mr. Parnell be endorsed by the Irish people at the next election we cannot see in what respect the prospect of a satisfactory measure of Home Rule would not be even better than it was last year before the split occurred. The Nationalist mem-

bers as distinguished from the Parnellites, include by much the the greater number of the men of talent in Irish political life. John Dillon, William O'Brien, Justin McCarthy and Thomas Sexton, are, in general ability and parliamentary skill, far above any man that can be named among Mr. Parnell's adherents, except himself. Their personal character is above suspicion, and their devotion to the cause of Ireland is at least as well tried as Mr. Parnell's. For ourselves, speaking as citizens of a free Government, which we believe to be the best for the public welfare now existing, we should much prefer to see Irish politics controlled by a body of representatives than by a single individual, even were his character unstained and his abilities pre-eminent. In our judgment the probability that such a body could secure and put to work a satisfactory system of self-government for Ireland is much greater than that such an end could be attained by the dictatorship of Mr. Parnell whatever his political skill.

As to the course which will be taken by the Irish people we see little reason to doubt that they will support the majority of their present representatives. In the two elections which have already taken place, the Parnellite candidates have been defeated by large majorities. There is no evidence of any change of feeling since among the voters. The principles on which they will have to act at the general election are the same as those on which the voters of Kilkenny and Sligo have acted already, and there is little doubt that the result will be similar. It is possible that a divison among the Nationalists would cause the loss of from three to five seats in Ulster, but both parties are well aware of the fact and the present members will probably be renominated in those doubtful districts. In Dublin and Cork there will probably be struggles between the Parnellites and the Nationalists, of which the issue is somewhat doubtful. One seat in the city of Dublin might be won by the Tories if the forces of their Nationalist opponents be divided. These are the chief dangers so far apparent to the Nationalist representation in Parliament, and they are not of a nature to seriously endanger the winning of Home Rule. It is significant that Mr. Parnell after challenging his colleague in the representation of Cork city to resign with himself and take the public verdict at the polls, subsequently avoided doing so. It may be that even before the general election the split in the party may be closed by Mr. Parnell's retirement, but we cannot say that such an event is very likely at present.

On the whole, then, though the cause of Ireland has met with a set-back, there is no reason to believe it is not still in the prospect of success. We have faith in the common sense of the Irish people as well as in the justness of their political instincts, and the issue now rests mainly with the Irish people themselves.

THE POPES AND THE TEMPORAL POWER.

1823—1846.

A GREAT Pope of this century, who, during a long and bitter experience of emperors, of kings, and of other cut-throats wearing no crowns, lost neither the happy wit nor the genial humor that Heaven had kindly loaned him, once said: "When I read the correspondence that passed between my predecessors and Louis XIV., I perceive that his Majesty thought himself to be the fourth person of the Blessed Trinity." Where there is wit there is truth, and the saying of the good, wise Pope, may well be applied to almost every prince, great or small, that has ruled over men within our Christian times. From century to century, from throne to throne, the idea of the divine prince has been handed down. To-day it is as living as when an Augustus or a Nero deigned to consort with Jove and Mars and Mercury. A just and patient God has, time and again, given an awful warning to those who proudly laid hands on the things that are His. And yet, during this very century, princes called Catholic, as well as non-Catholic princes, have vied one with another in usurping the rights that one sole power on earth has been commissioned to exercise. And the new kings, the people, will they show more wisdom, more humility, than those, hating or despising, whose "teeth have been broken?"

Bonaparte aspired to a grandeur far above that of Louis XIV. The imperial campaign against the Papacy, though mad, was worldly wise. Dreaming of an empire whose limits would be determined only when he had sheathed his bloody sword, he argued that the surest, readiest way to effect his purpose would be to destroy the centre of Christianity, submit the Spiritual to the despotic, and thus unite in his hard hands the mighty power that ruled minds with the meaner power that ruled matter. In Austria, in Prussia, in petty principalities, he saw the Cæsar-popes. He had helped to make them more monstrously despotic than ever. To realize his ideal of a despot of despots there was only one way. In himself he would combine the power of the Emperor and the power of *the* Pope. A madman's fancy indeed. What were all his fancies? And yet Bonaparte made so many of his mad fancies appear to be practical, that we are still wondering at what is called his "genius."

The failure of all the schemes of the once mighty Emperor relieved neither Church nor state from despotism. Freed from the Corsican's destroying sword, emperors, kings, princes, dukes joined in asserting an absolutism equal to that which he had exercised. Religiously and civilly the people suffered. From all sides the rights of the Church were assailed. Everywhere were her spiritual liberties hampered. Absolute rulers made, were bound to make, a servile clergy and irreligious populations. Napoleon's attack on the Papacy was so bold, so persistent, so studied, that it seizes the attention entirely. Our eyes fixed on him, we are apt to lose sight of the crowd of more cautious, though no less wicked, men who, before and after his downfall, hoped and tried to succeed in doing what he failed to do.

The last years of the reign of Pius VII. were years of struggle, constant, courageous, to preserve not alone the Temporal but also, and above all, the Spiritual Power of the Papacy. The Spiritual Power it is that despotism and iniquity hate. This it is that they would destroy were destruction possible. The attempt to abolish the Temporal Power is an attempt to abolish the Spiritual. There have been short-sighted men who could not see this most patent fact, but no Pope has been thus dull of vision. And indeed it is hard to understand how any one can avoid seeing and acknowledging this fact after a review of that short period of history which begins with the accession of Leo XII., and which ends with the death of Gregory XVI.

Leo XII., Della Genga, sat on the Papal throne during a scant five years and a half. (September 28, 1823, to February 10, 1829.) Only twenty-one months of honor and of trial were allotted to Pius VIII., Castiglione. (March 31, 1829, to November 30, 1830.) The brunt of tyranny, conspiracy, revolution, Gregory XVI., Cappellari, bore for well nigh sixteen years. (February 2, 1831, to June 1, 1846.) Of these three able, firm and kindly Popes, no one was imprisoned. Each of the three lived and died in the City of the Popes. For this good fortune they were least of all indebted to that land which claims to own the Papacy, and which assumes to dispose of the common Patrimony and of the common Father of the Faithful as though the Catholic Christian world were Italy's thrall.

Since the French Revolution, a new force has been directed against the Church—a force that, under the name of "the people," has disgraced, demoralized, and most shamefully abused all the peoples. The false philosophies, old or new, the heresies, the schisms of Christian times, have been combined; the heretics and schismatics of all countries have been united, secretly, into associations whose real aim is to destroy the Catholic religion, replac-

ing it by pagan naturalism. In order to attain this abominable end, the social structure must be overturned, and be builded anew. All governments, whatever their form, must therefore be undone. The vitality of Christian society, of just government, is centred in the Catholic Church. Logically, the Church should be completely disorganized if the Revolution is to be speedily and wholly successful. And the Catholic Church can be completely disorganized only by cutting off its head. Abolish the Papacy and there is an end to spirituality, to order, to law, to morality—such has been, such is to-day the argument of those who would sink mankind into a depth of slavery and of degradation lower than that out of which the Saviour lovingly lifted the world. In Italy it is, during a considerable portion of this century, that the most conscienceless, insane leaders of the most comprehensive of all heresies have been born and bred. Against the Papacy these leaders have fought with weapons filched from every armory. The sword and the dagger they have not despised, any more than the platform, the press and the pulpit. Of old the Church has faced the sword and smashed it, hilt and blade, with the irresistible arms of faith—prayer and sacrifice. The platform, the pulpit, the press, the Church has never feared. And the dagger? The dagger we begin to know. Even against the hidden dagger the Church has striven, will strive. What is its white, noiseless stroke to the glare, the thunder that rolls, that flashes from the gates of hell?

Throughout Italy the Carbonari were especially active after 1820, and especially murderous in the Papal States. To Americans the words Mafia, Mala Vita, Camorra, are not unfamiliar. These and similar associations of criminals and of bandits of high and low degree have long flourished in certain parts of Italy. With these associations, whose motive was protection in plundering and assurance of bloody revenge, the Carbonari did not interfere. Seeking immoral ends, they gladly used all ready-made criminal societies. The valuable, because trained, members of these societies, the Carbonari combined with men willing to commit crime, though still untrained, and with men less vicious, but passionate, easily moved by hot words and strange ideas.

Italy is not the only land whose civilization we measure by its public buildings and museums. And yet through all the years of art and poetry and song, the banditti have found a delightful abiding place under the mournful olive, the twining vine, and on the hills—purple, amethystine or blue. There are great names of princes, dukes, counts, who, within this very century, proudly confined themselves to the noble business of brigandage. Indeed, Italians, north and south, gloried somewhat in the brigands. They had never been put down. The conclusion followed, as night fol-

lows day, that the Italian was unconquerable.[1] Pius VII., Leo XII. pursued the brigands, who mastered no small portion of the Papal States, as late as the year 1825, and when the Abbate Pellegrini converted that hero of the popular song, Gasparone, the good Abbate and Cardinal Pallotti and Leo XII. were doubtless pleased with their good work.[2] And yet others, worse than Gasparone, were to come.

After 1821 street risings and assassinations were frequent in the Legations. In 1825, the year of the Jubilee, an attack was made on Cardinal Rivarolla, at Ravenna. The Carbonari had not yet acquired that skill which they afterwards gained by practice on their victims' corpses. The dagger missed the Cardinal, but lodged in a prelate's body and made an end of him. Similar efforts to "avenge the death of Christ and to re-establish His Kingdom" rejoiced the souls of Italian and foreign Carbonari up to 1830. On November 30th of this year, Pius VIII. died. His successor was not chosen until February 2d of the following year. The European governments that were so skilfully undermining their own authority were all anxious to lay hold on the Spiritual and Temporal Power of the Papacy. Through their ambassadors they tried to determine the action of the Conclave. In 1825 they had joined in opposing the proclamation of the Jubilee. "Nevertheless, the Jubilee shall be!" exclaimed Leo XII.[3] With few exceptions the governments were in the hands of Carbonari in 1825. Now, in 1830, they had a new ally in Louis Philippe, who had been lifted on the throne by the Revolution of July 27th—a revolution of which he had been one of the chief instigators, and, by all odds, the most contemptible.[4]

Neither Louis XVIII., nor his brother Charles X., had strengthened the hands of the good, inside or outside of France. They pursued a cowardly policy; a policy that Leo XII. disdainfully charged all the rulers of the day with following: "a policy of timidity towards the strong and of haughtiness towards the weak." When Charles X. was incontinently driven from the throne, there was little cause for regret. Louis Philippe was only a stop-gap. Gentlemanly revolutionists like Lafayette were not prepared for a republic. A revolutionary king could be removed by a revolution when he had himself prepared the country for the republic of the

[1] Cantu, *Histoire Universelle*, vol. xviii., p. 421. Paris, 1867.

[2] Cantu, *Hist. des Italiens*, vol. xi, pp. 340, 341. Wiseman: *The Last Four Popes*, p. 257. Boston, 1858.

[3] Wiseman, *The Last Four Popes*, pp. 247, 248. Cantu: *Hist. Univ.*, vol xviii., p. 368.

[4] An insight into the character of Louis Philippe and of his fellow Carbonari in France, as well as of the work of the revolution between 1830 and 1840 may be had from Louis Blanc's *Histoire de Dix Ans*.

Carbonari. Louis Philippe was a Carbonaro; so was his son and heir, the Duc d'Orleans; so were Lafayette, Guizot, Thiers, Cavaignac, Armand Carrel, Bayard, the Duc Decazes, Odilon Barrot, De Corcelles, and many other nobles, lawyers, officers, and adventurers—Voltairians, Huguenots, "Catholics"—who were willing to stoop low if, thereby, place and fortune might be attained or retained.

From such a government the Italian conspirators had everything to hope. Spaniards, Portuguese, Belgians, Poles had risen in arms, or were preparing to rise. There were grievances everywhere; but how many revolutions have bettered a people's condition? Carbonarism had spread over a large part of Europe within ten years. In Italy the youth and the middle class had been drawn into its net. As early as 1820 the order estimated its numbers in the kingdom of the two Sicilies at 800,000.[1] The chiefs did not favor a revolt. Buonarotti, the head of the *Alta Vendita*—as the clique that, from Paris, governed the Carbonari of Europe was called—deemed the time unpropitious and "the people" not wholly prepared. But the local leaders hungered for plunder and office, and for larger opportunities to use the dagger and the gun. The treacherous Menotti, whose name has been fittingly introduced into one of Garibaldi's numerous families, struck a first and most weak blow at Modena, on February 3, 1831. Parma, Piacenza, Bologna, Imola, Faenza, Forli, Cesena, Ravenna, Pesaro, Fossombrone, Fano, Urbino, Macerata, Camerino, Ascoli, Perugia, Terni, Narni, Ancona, followed quickly. The tricolor floated as gaily as though Bonaparte were alive and an emperor. His former consort, Maria Louisa, was expelled. At Bologna, the Cardinal Legate, Benvenuti, was imprisoned, and a provisional government established. Deputies from the various cities met and voted "the downfall of the Temporal Power of the Popes."[2] In Piedmont there were some ill-advised patriots. There the government favored only one sort of patriotism. The Piedmontese revolutionists were shot down. Ten days after the election of Gregory XVI. the mob fired the first shot in Rome. It was Carnival time—a time of gaiety and of "hearty pleasure." To the new Pope, who was considering what of good he could do for the real people, the revolution was a surprise. Evidently the insurrection had been timed, for the movement at Modena was made before the announcement of Gregory's election. Though crowds of expectant and armed strangers had gathered in the Holy City, and though money had been freely distributed to the Trasteverini, with corrupt intent, the insurgents were disappointed. The people drove out the dis-

[1] *Les Sociétés Secrètes.* P. N. Deschamps, S. J. Avignon, 1874, vol. i., p. 482.

[2] Cantu, *Hist. Univ.*, vol. xix., p. 25.

turbers. There were some wounded and some prisoners. The revolutionary force sought comfort and a livelihood among their more successful brethren, who had control of the Legations. Gregory XVI. was prompt in defending the Papal rights. His small army was at once sent against the insurgents. Probably their "deplorable rhetoric" and the jealousies of the leaders in the different cities would have, in time, revolutionized the peaceful citizens into loyal supporters of the Holy See; but it was important that order should be quickly re-established and maintained. Though the Papal army was not inefficient, the task seemed beyond its strength. Foreign aid Gregory would gladly have done without. Bernetti, his Minister, strongly favored an independent policy. Still the Pope looked upon foreign aid "as a necessity without an alternative." The provincial chests had been robbed, the finances disturbed seriously, obligations incurred. A strong hand was needed, and at once.[1] To Austria Gregory addressed himself, and to Naples. The government of Louis Philippe had adopted what was humorously called a policy of "non-intervention." This policy was meant for other powers; not for France. As the ministers interpreted it, no power excepting France could, with justice, interfere in the affairs of another country. Wherefore France objected to the Pope's receiving assistance from Austria. This officious intervention of France in the affairs of an independent sovereign neither Austria nor the Pope accepted submissively. Metternich sent troops across the Po. He was, he said, unwilling to admit "that brigands could object to the mounted police, or that incendiaries had a right of protest against the firemen."[2] On March 19th the Austrians entered the Papal territory. The powerful politicians who had so expeditiously abolished the Temporal Power, vanished like thinnest mist before a norther. Bologna, Ferrara, Ravenna opened their gates. At Rimini the insurgents made a stand and were badly beaten. Within ten days Ancona had fallen, the revolution was ended and the "brigands and incendiaries" were in the hands of the mounted police or of the firemen, or had escaped by sea or by land from the punishment they well deserved.

Why did the Carbonari fail in their scheme to overthrow the Papacy: a scheme evidently planned, if not well planned? Mazzini charges the French government with the failure. He is not a good witness. One of the most consummate liars that has ever darkened the shadow of the earth,—and his deliberate and con-

---

[1] Wiseman, *loc. cit.*, p. 385.

[2] Van Duerm, Charles, S. J., *Vicissitudes Politiques du Pouvoir Temporel des Papes de 1790 à nos Jours.* Desclée, de Brouwer et Cie. Lille, 1891.

tinuous untruthfulness are proven on page after page of his own "Life and Writings,"—no dependence can be placed upon his word. Doubtless his true life will be written some day; and when it is written the world may, or may not, be astounded at the vice and the villany that may be concentrated in a single human soul. However, Mazzini claims, and his charge has not been denied, that, before the insurrection, various influential Italians had drawn up a memorial inquiring of Latour Maubourg, the French ambassador at Naples, what the action of France would be in case an Italian revolution should provoke the armed intervention of Austria. This being true, we need not doubt that Latour Maubourg was a Carbonaro. And here it is worthy of noting that this same ambassador at Naples was chosen by the French ministry to enforce the policy of "non-intervention" on Austria and the Pope, when there was question of assuring the Sovereignty of the Papacy by putting down the insurgents of the Legations. How did Latour Maubourg answer the Italian Carbonari? "On the margin with his own hand he had written that France would support the revolution provided the new government should not assume an anarchical form, and should recognize the order of things generally adopted in Europe." These are Mazzini's words.[1] The requirements of the French Government are not too exacting. Did the Italian Carbonari show a disposition to exceed them? Their short rule was certainly not more anarchical than that of which Latour Maubourg was the mouth-piece. Why did the "last Voltairian of his age," as Louis Philippe claimed to be, the crowned Carbonaro, who was squeezed into a royal seat by the loving embrace of the Carbonaro, Lafayette,—why did his Carbonaro ministry, in part Voltairian like himself,—encourage and yet hesitate, and finally prove false?

Perhaps Metternich will assist us in unravelling the mystery. The Popes had been the first to warn the Christian world against the secret political societies. Pius VII., Leo XII., had only repeated their predecessors' words of wisdom. Of all the political men of his day, Metternich was the only one who grasped the full meaning of these warnings, and who, refusing to use, or to be used by the secret political associations, watched them closely and followed their devices with an experienced and a critical eye. From his "Memoirs" we learn not only somewhat of his estimate of the Carbonari, but we are especially informed about the Italian Revolution of 1831. From a letter to Apponyi, the Russian ambassador at Paris, dated February 15, 1831, we quote: "This vast network of conspiracy, which has been weaving in France

[1] *The Life and Writings of Joseph Mazzini.* London, 1864. Vol. i., p. 82.

for some time back, bears the visible impress of Bonapartism. The plan, as far as we yet know, is to deprive the Pope of his Temporal Power, and to form a Kingdom of Italy under the constitutional King of Rome." "There is nothing Italian in the measures by which the revolts have been accomplished. The Italian Revolution is a Bonapartist Revolution, supported by the party of anarchy in France."[1] On February 19th he again charges the Bonapartists with the responsibility of the Italian insurrections, and then informs Apponyi that during the Parisian rising of July, 1830, Joseph Bonaparte and Lucien, Prince of Canino, had approached him, offering to put the Duke of Reichstadt on the throne of France if he, Metternich, would consent to the Duke's *escape* from Vienna.[2]

The purpose of these dispatches to Apponyi we might doubt were it not for facts that cannot be doubted. Louis Philippe's position was a delicate position. A revolutionist, crowned by revolutionists, he had to establish his throne by gaining the recognition of the absolute governments that ruled Europe. As yet he dare not openly assist the anti-Papal revolutionaries. Carbonaro, Voltairian, he dare not, would not openly, oppose them. To use them he was willing, and he did use them. As things stood in Belgium, the Italian revolutionaries were serviceable to him, Bonapartist or not. If they were Bonapartist, he dare not assist them to victory, even if the Temporal Power of the Papacy were destroyed,—a Power he would gladly have finished. Was the Italian revolution a Bonapartist revolution? And did Louis Philippe owe his throne to an embrace which the *Alta Vendita* had afforded him because they were not certain upon whom to lavish it? Let us answer these questions with facts.

During the lengthy sitting of the Conclave that finally elected Mauro Cappellari, the Camaldolese monk, to the Papacy, Rome was not threatened by diplomatists alone. Bands of veterans and of Corsicans raced through the streets exciting the people to insurrection. They had a cry: "Italy!" first, and "Liberty!" last of all.[3] Corsicans—the word has a more definite meaning than the mention of it conveys. Mazzini's dictionary will make the meaning clear. "Carbonarism, introduced into Corsica by the Neapolitan exiles, was a ruling power throughout the island, and by the men of the people it was regarded—as such associations, when freely joined, should be—as a religion."[4] Who were the

[1] *Memoirs of Prince Metternich.* Charles Scribner's Sons. New York, 1881. Vol. v., pp. 103–104.

[2] *Memoirs of Prince Metternich, loc. cit.*, pp. 107–109.

[3] Cantu: *Histoire des Italiens*, vol. xi., p. 351.

[4] Mazzini, *loc. cit.*, p. 50.

leaders of these "veterans and Corsicans?" A certain Napoleon and a certain Louis, better and worse known in later years, both reputed sons of an ex-King of Holland. Their purpose was to make Italy a haven of liberty by placing on a new throne a new king—Jerome Bonaparte. The legitimacy of one at least of these Bonapartes has been questioned. But can there be any doubt of it? Did he not prove his direct descent from that Emperor whose scattered family found an asylum in Rome, where "they were allowed to have their palaces, their estates, their titles, not only unmolested, but fully recognized?" Ingratitude is the natural offspring of tyranny.

The Bonapartist rioters were scattered. Some were jailed. In or out of jail they were not idle, and when the revolutionaries rose against government after government, in 1831, the nephews of the first Napoleon were there to cheer on the unthinking crowd. One of these nephews, who afterwards deluged France with liberty, wrote, during these Italian troubles, a letter which, though frequently published since 1859, when it was first printed, merits a still wider circulation. "Very Holy Father, Mr. X. will tell your Holiness the truth about the situation of things here. He has informed me that your Holiness was afflicted when you learned that *we were here amid those who have revolted against the power of the Crown of Rome.*

"The Romagnoli especially are intoxicated with liberty. This evening they reach Terni, and I render them this justice, that among the cries they lift up continually, there is not one which attacks the head of Religion, thanks to the leaders who are, throughout, men most highly esteemed, and who, everywhere, prove their attachment to Religion as forcibly as their love for temporal independence. They wish, as it seems, and very decidedly, the separation of the Temporal and the Spiritual Powers.

"I speak the truth, I swear it, and I supplicate your Holiness to believe that I have no ambition.

"I can likewise affirm that I have heard all the young men say, even the least moderate, that if Gregory renounce the Temporal Power, they will adore him; that they themselves will become the warmest sustainers of true Religion purified by a great Pope and whose basis is the most liberal book that exists, the divine Gospel."[1]

Metternich was evidently well advised. Though the Gospeler who wrote this letter "had no ambition," other less unselfish Bonapartists had an ambition, that was not satisfied until it had made a great people sweat blood and treasure, pushed another Carbonaro

[1] P. Van Duerm., *loc. cit.*, p. 144.

usurper into the City of the Popes, and drawn down upon the name and the fortunes of the Napoleons a curse no less loud than that with which the Lord of Justice visited the Majesty that Pius VII. qualified as "immensely great."

"The Tartuffe of the alliance of the Kings," as Mazzini called Louis Philippe, might well hesitate to "free" Italy, when his ambitionless competitors were seeking a great crown in place of the lesser crown they had missed. For in the eyes of the Carbonari there was only one crown worth the having. "From Rome alone," said Mazzini, years afterwards, "can modern unity go forth, because from Rome alone can come the absolute destruction of the ancient unity."[1] "You know not that what elsewhere is but a word, becomes, if uttered by Rome, *a fact*, an imperial decree, *urbi et orbi*."[2] There are Catholics who pose as leaders of thought in this closing nineteenth and, shall we not say, in the coming twentieth century, and whose estimation of Papal Rome is not so great as Mazzini's, or Louis Philippe's, or Louis Napoleon's. The Carbonari view some questions from the house-top; and there are Canons and greater dignitaries whose vision is, unfortunately for them and us, limited by the four walls of a very small room. When the Catholic world estimates Papal Rome as highly and as out-spokenly as the Carbonari have done, and do, then the words that are spoken at Rome will indeed be facts, *urbi et orbi*. One fact known to all the world to-day is that Louis Napoleon, about the time he was "among those who had revolted against the power of the Crown of Rome," took the oath of a Carbonaro from the father of that Orsini who, after a fine Carbonaro fashion, tried to separate the spirituality of an emperor from the temporality of an emperor, by means of a fraternal bomb.[3] "To conspire against our august and only benefactor would be a nameless infamy," wrote the reputed father of Napoleon Louis and of Louis Napoleon, in 1821, to Consalvi, who knew where conspirators and conspiracies were hatched. "The Bonaparte family shall never have to address itself this reproach."[4] Can we wonder that an Orsini should conspire against a fellow-conspirator who had been condemned by his own royal sire to "nameless infamy?"

When the States of the Church had been freed from the insurgents, Louis Philippe's government showed a lively interest in the centre of Christianity. The Voltairians, as good Frenchmen, would not repudiate the tradition of the monarchy, a tradition to the effect that the Papacy could require no protection unless at such times as France was in a protecting mood. This beautiful tradition,

---

[1] Mazzini, *loc. cit.*, vol. v., p. 314.
[2] Mazzini, *loc. cit.*, vol. v., p. 186.
[3] P. N. Deschamps, *loc. cit.*, p. 354.
[4] P. Van Duerm., *loc. cit.*, p. 147.

though seemingly founded in a deep religious sentiment, was really a political tradition. Protection of the Papacy was an euphuism for opposition to Austria. And now that Austria was in the Papal States, traditionally France must drive her out. The Papal government had no wish to keep Austrian troops on Papal soil. Bernetti was no lover of Austrian methods or tendencies. He was desirous of freeing his government from foreign influences on the first favorable occasion. But when the French ministry pressed upon the Pope and upon the emperor a demand for an immediate evacuation of the States of the Church, neither Rome nor Vienna were inclined to be hasty. The demand of Louis Philippe was not unsupported. There were other powers backing his policy. Leisurely the Austrians withdrew, July 19, 1831, four months after their coming to the Pope's aid. In the year 1891, Piedmont, which is "protecting" the Pope with the gallantry of a true Bourbon or Orleanist, or Josephist, claims to be acting in its own right, and to exclude the action of all other governments. The alliances that manipulated the affairs of Europe, through Congresses, in 1831, looked upon the Papacy not as the subject of any power; and jointly they guaranteed, not the *independence* but the rightful rule of the Holy See.[1] Perhaps the Triple Alliance of to-day has elevated itself to a higher place in the direction of human affairs than the witty and good Pius IX. attributed to Louis XIV.

From the novel, our men and women, of whatever age, are by expert guides advised to learn history. Prince Metternich's Memoirs will give an intelligent youth a fuller knowledge of men and affairs, during the period with which we are concerned, than he can derive from the ideal historical novel—which has not been written. A fortnight before the Austrian forces withdrew from the Papal States, Metternich wrote to Apponyi that the emperor was determined "to respond to future appeals of the Holy Father for fresh aid, which his Holiness might be justified by certain circumstances in demanding."[2] Metternich had a thorough acquaintance with the Carbonari, Bonapartist, Republican, Orleanist, and a keen sense of Austria's interest in maintaining a position in the Papal States not second to the Revolution. His forecast was admirable. The Austrians gone, the Carbonari took up their appointed work just where they had stopped. Before the middle of January, 1832, the agitation had grown into an insurrection. Against the insurgents the Papal army moved. There were victories and defeats at Cesena, Ravenna, Forli, Ferrara. The Pope desired peace, for the good of the people and for the welfare of the Church. On January

[1] Cantu, *Histoire Universelle*, vol. xix., p. 28.

[2] *Memoirs of Prince Metternich*, vol. v, p. 124.

10th, he wrote to the governments of France, Austria, Russia and Prussia, stating that he meant to repress rebellion by force, and asking support in the interest of order, justice, and authority. Austria, Prussia, Russia answered, promising armed assistance if arms were needed. Louis Philippe's government answered as a Carbonaro government would answer. The rebellion was subdued without exterior aid; but to save the country from renewed agitation, Cardinal Albani, the Pope's legate, called upon Austria to reassume the positions it had held in July of the previous year.[1] Radetski was not slow in answering the legate's request, and the Carbonari furled the tricolor hastily. Need we say that the Austrians were received with joyous acclamations, *festas*, and the usual outbursts of "popular feeling."

To defend the Papacy from professional revolutionists, Louis Philippe was not willing, but Austria had hardly restored quiet when the Orleanists forced their "protection" on the Pope. A French fleet sailed into the harbor of Ancona, without invitation or warning, and seized the strong fortress. (February 22, 1832.) At this very time the Orleanist government was pretending to negotiate, through the Papacy, a joint occupation with Austria. Between the treachery of Orleanist and of Bonapartist, only a paid political casuist could formulate a nice distinction. The blow struck at the Temporal Power was direct; the encouragement given to the Carbonari was positive. England protested, Austria protested, the Pope protested; but the English protest was a sham,—a political protest, meant to influence France in the matter of the Belgian crown. The Casimir Périer ministry explained that the French commander had gone beyond his orders. Thus the incident was closed. The tricolor waved in Ancona, where the Orleanist soldiery remained until 1838, leaving Ancona when the Austrians withdrew from the Legations.[2]

Rightly did Metternich call the French plea of occupation "a farce." Rightly did he call the occupation an "inexcusable attack on the indisputable sovereign rights of the Holy See, rights consecrated by the sanction of so many existing treaties."[3] However, this bold attempt to discredit the authority of the Papacy, this public advertisement of Orleanist disdain for the Temporal Power, and of a readiness to use force against that Power in the interest of political scheming, was not remarkable when we recall the policy of the European governments, in regard to the Holy See, before and since 1815. During the Austrian occupation of 1831,

[1] P. Van Duerm., *loc. cit.*, p. 155.

[2] P. Van Duerm, *loc. cit.*, pp. 155–62, where quotations are made from some valuable documents, hitherto published, but here brought together usefully.

[3] *Memoirs*, *loc. cit.*, p. 215.

Russia, Prussia, Austria, France and England, through commissioners meeting in Rome, without invitation, of their own motion, drew up a so-called "Memorandum," which they presented to the Pope as a document worthy of his consideration. In this "Memorandum" they nominated modifications in the Papal administration which they deemed "vital." Five powers, two of them Protestant, one schismatic, one Voltairian, one not too Catholic, and all positively inimical, if we except Austria, deliberately sought to weaken the Pope's hand and to make the pacification of his territory almost impossible. England had done, was doing, would continue doing whatever it could devise to destroy the Temporal Power; the Orleans King was bound by a criminal oath, that he valued more than honor, to effect the same end; Prussia, Russia, absolutisms that owed their being and their continuance to persecution,—picture these powers councilling the Papacy how to manage the States of the Church. Shall we be surprised if, for years thereafter, not only the Patrimony of St. Peter but also France, Prussia, Austria, the whole of Germany, England itself, were nurseries of disorder, assassination, insurrection, revolution?[1]

"Joseph II. in Germany, and Leopold in Italy, assailed Papacy with the energy of reform. The priest Ricci, and the Synod of Pistoia, encouraged the emancipation. The Jansenists spread themselves everywhere, and endeavored to recall the ancient religious severity of primitive Christianity. Voltaire published a crusade against Catholic Rome, and supported it, if not with profundity of thought and historical philosophy, yet with an activity of weapons truly prodigious. Then the torrent broke forth; the revolutionary lava which swept the entire past from its throne. Then Napoleon, imprisoning the Pope, dragging him to Paris, threatening him, and obliging him to compromise politically with him, completed the disgrace and the abasement of the Papacy. Afterwards, the giant having fallen, and the political inertia allowing a return to the peaceful studies of philosophy, the spiritual and eclectic schools arose; schools which, without denying the religious sentiment, ceased to recognize the Papacy as an essential element thereto." Joseph Mazzini wrote these words.[2] They are quite as connected as any words that came from his frenzied mind. They are not truthful in detail, they are not philosophical, and yet in a general way they do state facts and show their intimate relation. Joseph II. in Germany, Leopold in Italy, Voltaire, the Revolution, Napoleon and his successors in France, Gallicanism, Jansenism, the eclectic philosophies and false "liberalism," aided one

[1] P. Van Duerm, *loc. cit.*, pp. 150–154.

[2] "From the Pope to the Council," 1832. *Vid. Life and Writings*, vol. v., p. 309.

another in misleading minds, corrupting hearts, debasing churchmen, and abasing the power of the Papacy. Thanks to the accordant opposition of governments, Christian and infidel, to the Spiritual and Temporal Authority of the Holy See, the pulpit, the professor's chair, the press, history, poetry, the novel, were turned against law, against morality, against all right, human and divine. And a secret conspiracy directed, in good part, each of these powerful engines to a common end.

The Carbonarism of Italy was merely a development of Weisshaupt's Illuminism, which long controlled not only German courts and universities, Catholic and non-Catholic, but also German bishoprics and archbishoprics and German seminaries. If its influence has been almost wholly removed from German Catholic circles within recent years, no small share of the glory is due to the Papacy. To-day we have many scribblers and talkers pushing hobbies of all sorts. Weisshaupt had synthesized the heresies and hobbies of the past. The new revolutionists, communists, socialists can offer us nothing wicked that he had not dreamed of and taken the means to realize. And never were means more cleverly, more reflectingly devised. In an oath-bound society, having some ninety or more degrees, he purposed to combine rich and poor, learned and ignorant, with a purpose disclosed only to the adepts, whose vice and intelligence fitted them for admission to the inner circle. This purpose was the overthrow of all hereditary and irresponsible power, the destruction of Christianity, and the renovation of the earth by the establishment of Naturalism. To carry out this purpose, Weisshaupt labored first among the powerful and the educated. Princes, diplomatists, clerics, teachers he sought and gained. He entered the seminaries, he went among the youth of the schools,—it was they, above all, whom he coveted. The "common people" he did not neglect, though he counted on their capture as certain, once he had gained the well-to-do, the learned and the youth. His success was notable; the corruption that followed more notable. Men of ability were blindly led into treacheries, conspiracies, crimes. Many had the courage to reverse their steps, but ambition, greed, sensuality tied many more to an organization whose uses to those that controlled it were immeasurable. Governments that hoped to make it serve power by opposing the Church and degrading the people, learned to fear for their own safety. They tried to kill the serpent they had warmed into life; the name fell into disuse, but the thing itself was not to die. In other countries the tenets of the Illuminati had been welcomed, and the Bonapartists, adapting the ritual of the North to the Southern people, had spread the venom of Naturalism among the

Italians in the early portion of the nineteenth century. For Italian Carbonarism was practically German Illuminism.[1]

What the Carbonari were, many witnesses have disclosed. Mazzini, who entered the society at the age of nineteen, claims to have known nothing of it before he was admitted, and not much for some time after. At Genoa, where his father was a professor of medicine, Joseph met a mysterious personage who, not without his consent, initiated him. Having, in answer to his questioner, expressed a readiness to *act*, to obey the instructions which should be transmitted to him from time to time, and to sacrifice himself, if necessary, for *the good of the Order*, he knelt before an unsheathed dagger and took an oath of blind obedience, no aim being mentioned to him or means. Then he was taught the signs.[2] Into the second rank he was promoted without receiving other information. Those who selected him had taken a good measure of the youth. He was commissioned to implant Carbonarism in Tuscany, he says. Probably he was chosen to do some fouler work, for the Carbonari had a hold on Tuscany since early in the twenties. He had already learned of "cousins,"—thus the members of each section addressed one another,—who were appointed to stab fellow-members that had spoken against the chiefs. "The Order no sooner discovered rebels than it crushed them."[3] All the "cousins" carried sword-sticks. The leaders, whom Mazzini describes, were godless men and thorough-going desperadoes. "We young men," he says, "were treated like mere machines."[4] A liberal training! "Intellectually," he found the Carbonari "were materialist and Macchiavellian." "They called themselves Christians in their symbolic language; yet, confounding religion with the Papacy and faith with superstition, they contrived to wither up the virgin enthusiasm of youth by a skepticism borrowed from Voltaire and the negations of the eighteenth century."[5] Priests, nobles, literary men, soldiers and "sons of the people" were serving in the ranks. They had no principle other than revolution. Mazzini was not the only young Italian that was seduced at the age of nineteen by calculating and by hardened elders. He had in him, however, the blood of a "free companion," and made a trade of conspiracy and of crime from the day he joined the Carbonari until his death, forty-five years later. During a lifetime spent in deceiving others, he seems to have reached a state of self-deception truly appalling. From Ausonio Franchi we have learned

---

[1] For a careful exposition of Weisshaupt's work, see P. N. Deschamps, *Les Sociètès Secrètes*, vol. ii.

[2] *Life and Writings of Joseph Mazzini*, vol. i., pp. 13–16.

[3] Mazzini, *Life and Writings*, vol. i., pp. 20–21.

[4] Mazzini, *loc. cit.*, vol. i., pp. 25–27.

[5] Mazzini, *loc. cit.*, pp. 71–72.

that a man may be honest in leading others to ruin; but, regretfully we say it, Mazzini proves himself to have been thoroughly dishonest. If passion, pride, obstinacy, and a terrible hate of God, of Christ and of virtue were honesty, then no name deserves higher praise.

Mazzini inveighs repeatedly against the influence of Voltairianism and of French philosophy on the Italians. Why this should anger him it is difficult to conceive. From this same philosophy he drew the first breath of his intellectual life. A great portion of the youth of Italy were, like him, infected with the destructive ideas that came out of France. They had lost faith, and with faith morality. The Church they would abolish, or at least forcibly constrain. Excited by the spirit of revolt, natural consequence of the philosophical teaching they had received and of the propaganda initiated by Bonaparte and supported, for quite other ends, by England and by Russia, the efforts of the educated youth were directed, whatever the career they chose, almost wholly to the uprooting of religion and to the development of what they called "a spirit of liberty." The German, the "foreigner" in Lombardy and in Venice gave the northern Italians an occasion for protest and for appeals to patriotism and to unity; but the "foreigner" was, in many subtle minds, only a convenient target. Aiming at it, apparently, they were really pointing at a larger and more imposing object. If we run over the names of the Italians who, in literture, caught the popular favor, from 1800 to 1846, we shall see that the greater number were anti-Christian, revolutionary, or doubtfully "liberal." Mazzini's attack on the false philosophy of the eighteenth century was unjust. Were it not for this philosophy his cousinship in the family of assassins and the number of his teachers, friends, and victims would have been much more limited. Foscolo, Leopardi, Niccolini, Tommaseo, Aleardi, Montanelli, Fusinata, Guerazzi, Prati, Canini—men after his own heart—owed their inspiration to the philosophy Mazzini pretended to despise; and yet they were revolutionists, and almost all of them were Carbonari. Men better known in English-speaking circles, like Silvio Pellico, had knelt before the naked dagger and sworn the slave's oath. Gioberti's friends have generally defended him against the charge of being a Carbonaro, but Mazzini's statement, fortified by the written words of the "Father of his Country," make one hesitate about expressing a verdict.[1] Perhaps Gioberti was not influenced by the false philosophy of the eighteenth century, and should this be true, the use of his name just here would

[1] See Gioberti's letter in *Mazzini's Life*, etc., vol. i., pp. 312, 313. See also, *Ultima Critica di Ausonio Franchi*. Milano, 1889, pp. 146, 147.

be untimely. Ausonio Franchi testifies that German philosophy was not without a certain influence in Italy during the first half of this century, and that this same philosophy served Italy no more than it has advantaged Germany—or America.

To govern a godless mob, a sword in each walking-stick and a hidden dagger—Heaven knows where!—is difficult work, even when Judge Lynch rules with a despotic sway. With your American education about liberty, equality and the majesty of the law, imagine yourself a Pope and your States a prey to graceless villains—whatever their title, profession, education, assumption—of the Carbonaro brood! What would you have done to assure order, to protect property, to secure the comfort of peaceful men who could not bring themselves to stab a fellow-man, a fellow-countryman, in any cause? Your freeman's blood rushes hot through your veins. You think of brutal punishments as fitted for brutal men. Let the respectable mob hang them! is perhaps your hasty verdict. Had the reigning Pope been an American, even he would not have favored your ideas of right. No one was hung without a trial in the States of the Church; and during the sixteen years that Gregory ruled not a soul suffered the death penalty for a political offence.

Carbonarism was bad, but not wicked enough for a man possessed; and Mazzini was possessed. Ambitious, heartless, half-educated, ill-educated, immoral, selfish, he aspired to the leadership of Italian secret politics. The men that handled him and others, he had studied. What a sorry lot they were he knew. The mechanism of the Carbonari he had mastered. He determined to set up for himself. Bonapartist, French, the Italians should no longer be. Italians they should be. They had philosophers of their own, "minds which had exhibited a power of generalization to which Italy had been hitherto a stranger—Bruno, Telesio, Campanella. In the works of these great men would be found the genius of a fraternization of religion and philosophy and of those institutions so indispensable for Italy."[1] "In Giordano Bruno, above all, would Italians discover that synthetic power inherent in Italian genius." "That which Christ, the great 'Initiator,' had done, humanity"—as personified in Mazzini—"could do."[2] Who was Christ, after all? "His intellectual grasp did not extend beyond the requirements of a single epoch."[3] Mazzini, whose grasp included the whole past and future, threw off Carbonarism in 1831, at the age of twenty-three, and organized "Young Italy," a secret society, whose constitution he has partly

[1] Joseph Mazzini, *Life*, etc., vol. ii., p. 213.
[2] Joseph Mazzini, *Life*, etc, vol. iii, pp. 141, 142.
[3] Joseph Mazzini, *Life*, etc., vol. v., pp. 364, 365.

disclosed. "The aim of Young Italy was revolution, though its labors would be essentially educational, both before and after the day of revolution."[1] This education was to be "directed ever to the teaching by example, word and pen, the necessity of insurrection. Secret in Italy, education would be public out of Italy."[2] The instruction and intelligence indispensable as preparatory to action would be secret "both in Italy and abroad." And on what day should the revolution begin? "When the insurrection had triumphed." Meantime, the society "will be governed by a provisional dictatorial power, concentrated in the hands of a small number of men." What is the meaning of the word "insurrection." Warfare by means of guerilla bands, a warfare that is invincible and indestructible.[3]

Every member of "Young Italy" swore "to obey all instructions, in conformity with the spirit of the society, given by his representatives in the brotherhood of Italians; and to keep the secret of the instructions, even at the cost of his life, NOW AND FOREVER." "Thus do I swear, invoking upon my head the wrath of God, the abhorrence of man and the infamy of the perjurer if I ever betray the whole or a part of this, my oath."[4] The name of God and of Christ Mazzini used as if he believed in one or the other, but he believed in neither. He was a pantheist. As for Christ—the Genoese revolutionist had elevated himself to a seat at least two ranks higher than that with which Louis XIV. was satisfied. These sacred names Mazzini used to mislead fools.

"Young Italy" made rapid headway. The land was soon filled with "affiliated." The Carbonari were won over. Local traditions, local beliefs, local prejudices, were accommodated. From the "Articles" of the Neapolitan branches we shall learn more even than Mazzini tells, and we shall see how elastic was the "Constitution." "Article 1. The society is instituted for the indispensable destruction of all the governments of the Peninsula and to form a single State of the whole of Italy, under the republican form. Art. 30. The members who do not obey the orders of the secret society, and those who disclose its secrets, will be poignarded without pardon. Art. 31. The secret tribunal will pronounce the sentence, designating one or two of the affiliated for its immediate execution. Art. 32. The affiliated who shall refuse to execute the sentence pronounced shall be counted a perjurer, and as such, put to death forthwith. Art. 33. If the condemned victim should escape, he shall be unintermittently pursued, and the cul-

[1] Joseph Mazzini, *Life*, etc., vol. i., p. 99.
[2] Joseph Mazzini, *Life*, etc., vol. i., p. 106.
[3] Joseph Mazzini, *Life*, etc, vol. i., pp. 107–109.
[4] Joseph Mazzini, *loc cit.*, pp. 112, 113.

prit shall be struck down by an invisible hand, even were he to seek refuge in the bosom of his mother or in the tabernacle of Christ. Art. 34. Each secret tribunal shall be competent, not only to judge culprit adepts, but also to have put to death all persons whom it has condemned to death."[1]

The civilization of the dagger Mazzini practiced and preached throughout his life. Thirty-five years after the adoption of "Young Italy's" constitution, he proclaimed openly the "sacredness of assassination," and defended the use of the dagger "to initiate insurrection."[2] In at least one American city a monument has been raised to this libel on manhood, and a tender poet, whose locks were more than gray, eulogized this hater of Christ and apostle of the dagger. Let us hope that our American youth may not learn, from poet or statue, to estimate assassination as sacred, though the chosen victim cling to a mother's bosom, or seek refuge in the tabernacle of Christ.

His own life Mazzini preserved carefully, though he claims to have carried on his person, for years, a powerful poison, with which to end life in case he were made a prisoner. His secrets he wished to carry away with him. Suicide he preached to others. It was "the elevated height of a sacrifice." "When, owing to the wickedness of men, you feel yourself in danger of yielding to sin, cast away your life, and, rather than sin against others, charge yourself with a sin against yourself. God is good and merciful. He will shelter you beneath the vast wings of his pardon."[3] Thus he incited his victims to kill themselves that he might live and enjoy. And as they assassinated at his order, so they took their own lives "rather than sin against others." What a weight of woe this one bad man brought upon the world! How many homes he wrecked, hearts he broke, lives he blasted! Once, at least, remorse drove him "to the confines of madness." He was still young. Unrepenting, his mind was, nevertheless, spared him, and he used it as of old to inveigle Italians into the noble army that he was rallying around "the banner of the fathers of the 18th century, which dyed red in the blood of Christ, was transmitted by Luther to the Convention, to be raised upon the corpses of those slain in the battles of the peoples."[4] Students, the commercial class, many of the nobility, priests, soldiers, everywhere joined the new conspiracy. "On the educated youth especially, Mazzini exercised a demoniacal

---

[1] *Histoire de la Révolution de Rome*, par A. Balleydier. Paris, 1854 (4th edition), p. 18.

[2] "On the Theory of the Dagger," 1856. See Joseph Mazzini, *Life*, etc., vol. vi., pp. 266–277.

[3] Joseph Mazzini, *Life*, etc., vol. i., pp. 333–334.

[4] "Faith the Future," Joseph Mazzini, *Life*, etc., vol. iii., p. 121.

power of attraction."[1] The only religion, he told them, was Liberty. And "Liberty is the right of every man to exercise his faculties without impediment or restraint in the accomplishment of his special mission, and *in the choice of means most conducive to its accomplishment*"[2]—an inviting doctrine to young or old, and one that is too commonly accepted in and out of Italy. He taught the youth also that "an Italy such as the aspirations of our hearts foretell, can never exist until the Papacy shall be overthrown in the name of the Moral Law, and acknowledged as high above all pretended Intermediates between God and the People."[3] The Pope! The Pope! He was the one great enemy, an enemy to be crushed at all cost. "The moral power of the Papacy had long been dead in Europe. Luther destroyed it by withdrawing from it the North." "Though eminently a revolutionist, Luther rejected all other weapons than words," but men sworn to "substitute the sacred word PROGRESS for the dogma of direct revelation,"[4] would work with arms more effective.

Banished from Italy, banished, nominally, from France, Mazzini, hatched conspiracy in many lands. Hand and glove with ministers, kings, revolutionaries of all countries, and of all classes, he was cared for by rulers and by cabinets, by clergymen of all Christian and un-Christian denominations, and was lauded and petted by "tender" women, by "patriotic" men, and by keener folk of every degree. Many other secret societies were organized in Italy, but, one after another, they "accepted his creed and submitted to his direction." "Young Poland," "Young Germany," "Young Switzerland," with kindred aims and methods, were formed under his guidance. In "Young Europe" the revolutionaries were combined, with a creed whose tenets were simple enough: "One God, one ruler—His Law, and One sole interpreter of that law—Humanity." "Rejecting every doctrine of external, immediate, and final revelation," these societies "rejected the idea of any intermediate source of truth between man and God, other than genius united with virtue"[5]—through the sacred bond of the dagger, a musket and forty cartridges.

In the theories of Mazzini there was nothing new. The idea was the old one of a universal conflagration that should burn out the very roots of that "baleful plant sprung from Judæa's mould."[6]

---

[1] *Geschichte der Neuern Litteratur.* Adolph Stern, Leipzig, 1884. Vol. vi., p. 458.

[2] Joseph Mazzini, *Life*, etc., vol. iii., p. 32.

[3] Joseph Mazzini, *Life*, etc., vol. iv., p. 206.

[4] Joseph Mazzini, *Life*, etc., vol. i., p. 192.

[5] Joseph Mazzini, *Life*, etc., vol. iii., pp. 30–37.

[6] A. Balleydier, *Hist. de la Révolution*, etc., vol. i., p. 12.

His methods were not wholly new, though his application of these methods was in somewhat original. To the old idea of Italian nationality he gave a fresh impetus. He inflamed the Italian pride; he gave a body to all the hates of the vicious, the unbelieving, the ambitious, the criminal. Along with the dagger, he encouraged the press, the pamphlet, the novel. Good men were held up to scorn, were driven from honorable places, were libelled into retirement and silence. All honest leaders and teachers who would not forswear God and manly independence, were persecuted shamefully and shamelessly. Thou shalt lie! held equal place with Thou shalt kill! in the "law of Humanity." Austria had no need of spies in Italy. The remodeled Carbonari denounced every third man as an informer, a coward, a traitor.[1] Palmerston's immoral principle: Agitate, agitate! was followed out faithfully. Amid insurrections, demonstrations, a warfare of guerillas and of calumniators, what of unity, what of liberty, the real Italian people enjoyed between 1823 and 1846, may be easily imagined. The despotism of a mob made the despotism of dukes, grand-dukes and kings appear to thinking men most desirable.

The spirit of nationality was not cherished by Mazzinians alone. In Lombardy and in Venetia, where the Austrian rule was disliked, and not unreasonably, the men who, on account of their family, or their education, thought themselves entitled to honors and emoluments that went to strangers, were desirous of throwing off a foreign yoke. The Piedmontese dynasty, whose ambition it had been, for centuries, to hold the first place in the Peninsula, secretly encouraged the anti-Austrian feeling, and made use of it to extend Piedmont's influence. Revolutionaries who conspired to introduce republicanism into Piedmont could hope for no quarter; but in Tuscany, in the Romagna, they might freely do their worst. The d'Azeglios, the Balbos, talked and wrote fine words about the Church and the Papacy, but in their liberalizing way, devoted as they were to the enlargement of the power of Piedmont, and to the advancement of their own family and personal interests, they did more than enough to weaken respect for both Pope and Church. Like Gioberti and Rosmini, they assumed to apprehend the undisclosed designs of Providence, and to know more about civil and ecclesiastical government than all existing or pre-existing Popes and cardinals knew or had known. By their histories, novels, politico-philosophical writings, diatribes, spreading false principles, distorting history, creating divisions among well-meaning and not too well-instructed Catholics, calumniating the most intelligent and most competent defenders of the

[1] Cantu, *Hist. des Italiens*, vol. xii., p. 118.

Church, they aided the revolution; for thus they fostered a spirit of unrest and of dissatisfaction. Exaggerating evils, they offered no practical remedies. Their view of the Papacy differed not, radically, from the revolutionary view. To them the Papacy was first of all an Italian institution. The union of the Italian States would add to the power, the glory of the people of Italy, the noblest, grandest, most civilized, most intellectual people that there was in the world. And this union should be made more glorious by the precedence conceded to the Pope as an Italian prince. The constitution of the Church, the relations of the Pope to the Christian world, these men did not understand; much less did they have any true conception of the rights of Christendom in the States of the Church. Conceited meddlers, they did immeasurable harm to religion, to the Papacy and to Italy.

Despotisms the governments of Italy were, but had the Poles or the Irish been as well treated as the Italians, what happy peoples they would have been! The Austrian government in the Lombardo-Venetian Kingdom was, in many senses, very good; no less good were the Tuscan and Neapolitan governments. From 1830 to 1846 the people of Italy enjoyed more comfort, more ease, and bore less burdens than do the "United" Italians of 1891. The finances were wisely administered, riches abounded, and the well-being of the people was carefully looked after. "An Arcadia," Cesare Cantu calls Tuscany.[1] Indeed the development of the Carbonari and of "Young Italy," and their constant guerilla warfare during this period, are unanswerable proofs of the fortunate material condition of the country. How otherwise would this army of bravos, of idlers, of paraders, banqueters, and of *café* politicians—each with one dagger, at least, and a musket, not to mention the forty cartridges—have been supported? The throats of these fellows were not inflamed, nor their stomachs filled, nor their vices gratified by the use or exchange of spring water and of balmy air. The wealth of the country explains in good part not only the number of these loafing conspirators, but also the light hold of religion on many of the clergy and of the people. Luxury breeds irreligion. Nowadays it is the fashion to charge poverty with all the evils mankind suffers. This is an evil of which Italians, sixty years ago, had less experience than they have since had. And how was it with the inhabitants of the Papal States? We have seen all they had to suffer from Napoleon; and yet, as early as 1817, Tito Mansi, a former Minister of Murat, speaking to Metternich who was journeying through Northern and Central Italy, testified to the wonderful success of Consalvi in

[1] See Cantu, *Hist. des Italiens*, vol. xii., pp. 69-102.

improving the condition of the people. The best evidence of how conscientiously Leo XII. and Pius VIII. pursued their predecessor's policy is found in the rapid growth of the population of Rome. On the return of Pius VII. there were only 77,000 people in the city. By 1830 this number had been more than doubled, the exact figures being 170,000.[1] Within a few weeks after his election, Gregory XVI. began the two great tunnels which dividing the waters of the Arno, secure the picturesque Tivoli from inundation; and during a long reign in which he had to cope not only with Carbonari, but with the cholera plague and with the losses occasioned by fatal earthquakes, he was constant in building public edifices, improving roads, forwarding all the arts, introducing meantime real ameliorations in the various municipal and provincial laws.[2] His public and private charities were unstinted. His reforms in the administration were numerous, and would have been more so had he not been hampered by the governments of Europe, as well as by the guerillas and assassins.

"A few individual exceptions apart—the Romans had never shared that ferment, that desire for liberty which had constantly agitated Romagna and the Marches," wrote Mazzini.[3] He might have added, truthfully, that not all the inhabitants of the Romagna and of the Marches were natives. There exiles and adventurers from many countries had gathered to do the appointed work of "Young Italy." From Ancona as a centre, the French, during their occupation, had exerted an influence prejudicial to the Papacy. False ideas about Liberty and about Nationality had been maliciously spread abroad. Provided Austria were hated, the Papacy might take its chances. This French propaganda favored the guerillas, who wished above all to be rid of the Papacy. "What the factions in the Legations want," wrote Metternich, in 1832, "is not to get good laws, but to shake off Pontifical rule";[4] and the judgment was as just fourteen years later as when it was written. "Perish the Papacy and long live Italy!"[5] Such was the motto that inspired the conspirators in Romagna and the Marches. Expectantly, they had for eight years been "educating" rich and poor, young and old. Beginning with 1840, they handled the stiletto more openly, more audaciously. Disorder everywhere, public speeches against kings and Popes, insurrections—such is the story of the last years of the reign of Gregory XVI. False news

---

[1] See a speech of M. de Falloux in *L'Expédition de Rome*, en 1849, par Leopold de Gaillard. Paris, 1861. Page 289.

[2] Wiseman, *Last Four Popes*, pp. 386-406-462.

[3] Joseph Mazzini, *Life*, etc., vol. v., p. 201.

[4] *Metternich, Memoirs of*, vol. v., p. 218.

[5] Joseph Mazzini, *Life*, etc., vol. v , p. 263.

was daily given out, telling of risings elsewhere. To excite minds, the lie was used savagely. The character of the insurrections in the Papal States and of the "education," not of six but of sixteen years, we know. "In Romagna nearly all those men who, rich in honors, employments and pensions, cry anathema upon us at the present day, were then the agitators who swelled our ranks. There are workingmen yet living in Bologna who will remember Farini loudly preaching massacre in their meetings, and his habit of turning up his coat sleeves to the elbow, saying: '*My lads! we must bathe our arms in blood!*'"[1] And they did bathe their arms in blood, aye and did tear the flesh off from their victims' bodies—all in good time. From a blind hate of Catholicity, the Protestant rulers and peoples of Europe and of America have encouraged and honored these barbarians. Who knows? At home, the patrons may yet be forced to take payment in kind from grateful *protégés*.

"Young Italy" was ready to attempt a general insurrection. Thanks to England, the society had many centres on the Mediterranean, at Malta and Corfu, as well as at Leghorn. Here Italian exiles, the desperate and the exalted from France, Spain, Poland, Germany, Switzerland, Corsica were gathered. In the north, Bologna was the centre of the revolutionary movement. Money flowed even more freely than "brothers'" blood. Nowhere did the insurrection succeed. The Bonapartists were active in directing the revolution. Faithful Bonapartists! How can the sustainers of "true Religion whose basis is the most liberal book that exists, the divine Gospel"—how can they ever compensate you for your knightly service?[2]

What had Gregory XVI. been doing for the world while the hate of the churches and of the knowing sons of Satan combined against the Spiritual and Temporal Power of the Papacy? He had been combating heresy wherever it lifted a viperous head. He had been re-establishing hierarchies, reforming the clergy, presenting to Christian society new models of holy, charitable living and dying—among others, Saint Alphonsus Liguori. Against Spain, robbing the clergy; against Portugal, Switzerland, South America, robbers all of Church property and invaders of Church rights; against persecuting Prussia, that attacked the Christian family, he had fought a good fight, quick to meet every enemy and strong to oppose injustice and immorality. The uprising of the Belgians against religious servitude, he did not disap-

[1] Joseph Mazzini, *Life*, etc., vol. i., p. 314.

[2] A lively picture of the Italian States, between 1830 and 1846, Cantu gives, vol. xii., pp. 69–138. Cantu's views are not always reliable, however. They were not all based on self-evident truths. He had theories as early as 1830. His facts are colored by these theories.

prove. The hopeless revolution of Poland against Russia he wisely disapproved. The cruel, apostatizing Czar Nicholas, he held up to the scorn, and to the reprobation of the world. To this schismatic Pope, in person, he protested against the horrors to which Catholics in Russia were habitually condemned. Facing the Goliath, he said with calm courage: "Soon we shall appear before the tribunal of God; I should not dare to meet the eye of my Judge, had I not defended the religion of which I am the protector and you the oppressor."[1] Bearding the mightiest, Gregory, hand on hilt, was prompt to seek out and to defend the weak. The traders in the black flesh and red blood of the negro—flesh and blood which Christ despised no more than ours—the just, valiant, loving Pope excommunicated.

This Gregory, you can see, consulted no smooth-bore canonists, no chivalrous champions of the "independence" of the Papacy, no subtle propagandists of the theory that the cause of religion could be best advanced by centering sovereignty in the hands of the oppressor, and by abasing the one, sole, appointed protector of the spiritual to the uncushioned foot-stool of uncrowned and homeless helplessness, while the stilettoed pedagogues of theories not more illogical disturbed Romagna and the Marches. The Papal army pursued the brigand "liberals" determinedly. Again and again they were routed, subdued. The real "people" gave no free support to the Carbonari. At Rimini, the last revolt was attempted and suppressed in 1845.

On June 1st, 1846, Gregory XVI., who had long suffered from a fatal disease, fixed his eye, hopefully, calmly on the eye of the Judge. True to the Papal conscience, he had sacrificed no jot or tittle of the patrimony of Saint Peter, no right of the Church. The traditions handed down to him by his experienced, learned, Heaven-guided predecessors, he had preserved and handed down intact. No one was less likely than he to play the part of Judas. Before sitting on the Papal throne, an obedient servant within a monk's modest cell, he had written a work on "The Triumph of the Holy See." There he had not forgotten the rights of "nationalities" while defending the Papal rights. How could he? All rights rest on a common foundation. Listen to the monk's words! 'An unjust conqueror, with all his power, cannot deprive of its rights a nation unjustly conquered. By force he may enslave it, overturn its tribunals, kill its representatives; but never can he, without its consent, formal or tacit, deprive it of its original rights relative to these magistracies to these tribunals, that is to say, of its sovereignty.'[2] Not otherwise spoke Gregory, the Pope. Is there

[1] Cantu, *Hist. des Italiens*, vol. xii., p. 133.

[2] Cantu, *Hist. des Italiens*, vol. xii., p. 132.

a Pope to come that shall speak otherwise? No! The "liberals" of to-day, Catholic or revolutionary, may quibble, scheme, perorate, rave, but to the invasion of the unjust conqueror, Italian, Austrian or French, the Popes will neither formally nor tacitly consent. And without their consent, though force may imprison, overturn, kill boldly, or with the assassin's dagger, the Papacy cannot be deprived of its rights of sovereignty.

And how warmly, how courageously, how unitedly the Catholics of the world, hierarchy and laymen, should rally to the support of the Temporal Power of the Papacy! "The strength of the enemies of religion is in the feebleness of honest men," said a simple and clear-seeing Trasteverino during the revolution of 1849. Was there ever truth told in simpler, wiser words? The enemies of religion will defy God, glorify the devil, stiletto prelate and peasant, in the effort to annihilate Faith and its defender, while honest feebleness argues how it may stand from under, and let down gently, that Papacy which Donoso Cortes eloquently, rightly called "the dome of the edifice of European civilization." Under the dome of the sovereign Papacy must all civilization gather. For there is but one true civilization—the civilization of the one true Church, under one Head, sovereign with a sovereignty both spiritual and temporal.

THE ENCYCLICAL "RERUM NOVARUM."

THE judgment of the world has already ranked the Encyclical "*Rerum Novarum*" among the most momentous utterances not only of Leo XIII., but of all the occupants of the Chair of Peter. It deals with the weightiest social problem now engaging the attention of mankind, a problem intimately concerning every class of people in every civilized community. Truly does the Holy Father say:

"At this moment, the condition of the working population is the question of the hour; and nothing can be of higher interest to all classes of the State than that it should be rightly and reasonably decided." He brings to its discussion his vast learning, his broad statesmanship, his long observation of contemporary social movements, and withal, the spirit of the Good Shepherd who has said to him: "Feed my lambs; feed my sheep." Thoughtful men everywhere, irrespective of creed, acknowledge that he has struck the only chord that can bring forth harmony from a question which to many has seemed fraught with hopeless and universal discord.

The problem bristles with practical questions on which even Catholics have differed and have freely taken opposite sides. Although with most delicate consideration for the convictions and sensibilities of all, the Pope does not hesitate to state his own conclusions clearly and positively. He does not, indeed, issue an *ex cathedra* definition on any point; still it is as Pastor of the Universal Church that he speaks, and his teaching is vested with an august authority which will be sure to meet loyal docility from all faithful Catholics, and thus put an end to controversies which have unprofitably divided their counsels and their endeavors.

The Holy Father does not hesitate to declare that in the economic systems now prevailing there are conditions which are contrary not only to charity but to justice. And he declares that for these conditions "some remedy must be found, and found quickly." In so asserting, he is faced by the doctrine of "*laissez-faire*" which has been everywhere prevalent since the days of Adam Smith. But this doctrine, while to some degree justifiable as a reaction against the extreme governmental interference and control which had existed under the old "mercantile system" of economics, has proved itself to be equally an extreme in the opposite direction of individualism, and to be equally irreconcilable with sound social principles and with true social well-being. He declares that things

can no longer be left to adjust themselves, and that all influences must now co-operate to bring about a juster equilibrium.

And first he tests the method of adjustment proposed by socialism, and proves it to be not only inefficient but destructive, tending to aggravate the very evils which it pretends to cure.

Here the Holy Father will doubtless be charged by one or another class of socialists with having misunderstood or misrepresented their tenets. It is true, indeed, that there are various species of socialism, as of almost every other form of error. Viewed in regard to economic principles, there is *communism*, which vests the ownership of all things in the community and divides to each individual *according to his needs;* and *collectivism*, which vests in the community the ownership of the land and of instruments of labor, and gives to each individual *according to his work*. From the stand-point of political forms, it divides off into *centralism*, which would place the economic administration of a country under one central authority; *federalism*, which would make each local community independent, yet unite them by federal relations; and *anarchism*, which, looking upon all governmental combination as a meddlesome, costly, and oppressive evil, rejects even the bond of federation and would make each community an independent whole. Finally, as to methods of action, there is *revolutionary* socialism, which would bring about a readjustment by violently throwing the present state of things into chaos; and *political* socialism which would accomplish its results gradually by legislative changes.

With the differences in these various forms of socialism, the Holy Father is well acquainted. But instead of following them through the subtleties of their disagreements, he strikes them in the vital points in which they all agree or to which they logically lead. These are, the denial of the right of individual property in land, and the substitution of public authority for individual initiative and for domestic society, in their own proper spheres.

As to the first, he pictures beautifully the relationship established between man and the land on which he spends his labor and his skill; or the land which he has received in exchange for the money that represents his labor and his skill, and which he may pay another for tilling in his stead. He shows how, by division of avocations, and by the control of "the laws of individual peoples," private ownership may be perfectly reconciled with the public good. And he appeals to "the common opinion of mankind," which finds the foundations of this right in the law of nature, and has sanctioned it by the practice of all ages.

Carping critics have here alleged that the Pope errs in supposing that individual ownership of land has in all ages existed among all peoples, whereas history proves the contrary. But im-

partial readers will easily see that the Holy Father makes no such mistake; that he draws a clear distinction between *the principle* of private ownership and *the fact* of private ownership; that in the social systems of every age he finds the principle expressly recognized or implicitly involved, and in their tendency a constant advance towards the fact "as being pre-eminently in conformity with human nature, and as conducing in the most unmistakable manner to the peace and tranquility of human life." In other words, it is both a result of advancing civilization and a means to its further and further advancement, and therefore has its foundations in human nature itself. When a people is in a wild, nomad state, land is always held in common; as it settles into a normal social organization, individual ownership for a term of years is established, and the term grows longer as the social system becomes more stable; when fully civilized, the capabilities of the individual citizen assert themselves more strongly and demand fuller trust and independence, his rights grow with his capabilities, and full ownership of land by individuals becomes the universal rule. This tendency is in the very nature of things, and thus the Holy Father's appeal to the facts of all ages is absolutely correct.

Some again have objected that, in placing the foundations of private ownership of land in nature itself, the Pope has forgotten that, in point of fact, all private ownership of land has come from the public authority and remains subject to it. But, again, it is gratuitous to suppose any such oversight on the part of the Holy Father. On the contrary, in the fact of private ownership he clearly asserts the two factors. He says "the limits of private possession have been left to be fixed by man's own industry and by the laws of individual peoples."

We have in the development of our own country a striking illustration of the combination of these two factors in the origin and the nature of private ownership of land. When the Cabots took possession of our Atlantic coast in the sixteenth century, they did so in the name of England, and the world recognized England's claim. Had they attempted to take possession of it, or of any part of it, in their own individual name, the world would have laughed at their presumption. England gave charters to colonies or grants to proprietors, reserving a suzerainty over the whole. When this suzerainty was cast off by the Declaration of Independence and the treaty of peace, a hot controversy arose as to the proprietorship of the immense territory lying westward from the Atlantic States. Finally it was agreed that this territory belonged not to any individual State, but to the United States. Nearly all of that vast expanse is now in the hands of individual

owners; but not an inch of it is owned save by and under the authority of the United States.

This much as to the origin of private ownership. Now as to its limits. No one would assert for a moment that private ownership is absolute and without limits. Not only do all recognize the State's right of eminent domain, and its right to tax the land for the support of the government and for the establishment and maintenance of poor-houses, asylums, schools, and other institutions of public necessity, but all acknowledge the right and even assert the duty of the government to hinder individuals from using their land in a manner that would be detrimental to the public weal.

The just conciliation of these two sets of rights, the public and the private, secures both public order and private prosperity. From insisting too exclusively on the one or on the other, have arisen most of the controversies which have been wasting time and exciting minds needlessly and fruitlessly. The principles plainly stated or clearly intimated by the Holy Father will go far towards clearing up this important subject.

In the second place, he proves that socialism, by subjecting individual energies to the dictation of the despotic social organization at which it aims, by hindering the laborer from investing his savings in the way which he knows to be best for the permanent utility of his family, and especially by substituting the civil power for parental authority in the regulation of the household, "would injure those whom it is intended to benefit, would be contrary to the natural rights of mankind, would introduce confusion and disorder into the commonwealth," and instead of elevating the laboring classes, "would in reality be the leveling down of all to the same condition of misery and dishonor."

The views of the Holy Father in regard to socialism are strikingly corroborated by a recent article of Herbert Spencer in which he proves that, could socialism be established, its inevitable result would be to hinder personal initative, to stamp out energy, and to lead the working classes "from freedom to bondage."

Having shown how delusive is the remedy offered by socialism, the Holy Father proceeds to set forth the true remedy for the social evils of the day. When the Encyclical was announced as forthcoming, there were many who sneeringly predicted that it would be simply the pious and unpractical production of a mediæval theologian, preaching charity and resignation on the one hand and recommending a utopian theocracy on the other. Nothing could be farther from the truth. He speaks indeed of charity and resignation, giving motives which conduce powerfully to both; but he

speaks no less forcibly of equity and justice, of tyranny and retribution. He shows the indispensable need of the Church's influence; but he shows no less clearly the need of the strong arm of civil authority and the tough shield of judicious organization for self-defence. He writes indeed with the enlightened wisdom of a true theologian; but not less with the clear broad-mindedness of a philosopher and the practical acumen of a keen political economist.

He begins by casting aside the theories both of the optimist, who promises an existence entirely freed from social ills, and of the pessimist, who sees only a gloomy struggle for existence with class arrayed against class in hopeless hostility. He shows that the former is mistaken, because men, though equal in the essentials of humanity, are born and must continue to be born unequal in talents, strength and energy, whence inequality of fortunes must inevitably result; because labor is unavoidable, and labor will always be distasteful, hard and exhausting; because sickness and death cannot be evaded, bringing suffering and bereavement in their train the wide world over. He shows that the pessimist is equally wrong, because inequalities, far from being an evil in themselves, are a necessary condition for the development of human energies and the working out of human progress, and because, if truth and justice and charity be observed, as they can and ought to be, there is no good reason why the various classes of society should not, like the various members of the human body, act together in unity and harmony.

The attainment of this result must, however, he clearly shows, depend primarily and chiefly on the influence of religion and the action of the Church of Christ. She alone supplies the moral principles and the spiritual power without which the solution is simply impossible. Many an earnest thinker has wrought out the same conclusion, even from an opposite starting point. Years ago, John C. Calhoun exhausted all the powers of his strong and penetrating logic in the endeavor to devise a system of political balances and checks which would protect the rights of a minority against the power of a majority. After working out the problem with mathematical closeness to the very end, he closes the essay by acknowledging that no combination is possible which would make right fully secure against might. It is precisely what Leo XIII. insists upon. With the dynamic powers of checks and balances, must be blended the religious convictions, the moral principles, and the spiritual power, which the Prince of Peace imparts through His Church, or social reformers must strive in vain.

In the name, therefore, of Christ and His Religion, the Holy Father strikes down with one blow that horrible perversion of

humanity which, both as to employers and as to the employed, has been the very foundation of the system of economics taught, and so long and disastrously acted on, by the Manchester school and by the whole tribe of "*laissez-faire*" political economists. Their fundamental notion is "the economic man," who, as employer, is, according to their own definition, "a money-making animal," "a being influenced by two motives only—to acquire wealth and to avoid exertion," and who, as employee, is, in the Pope's energetic words, "a chattel to make money by. . . . . merely so much muscle or physical power." Against such a definition of man, such a description of the two classes into which human society is necessarily divided, the Vicar of Christ enters an indignant protest, in the name both of reason and of religion. Together with this execrable foundation, he repudiates the whole system of economics that has been reared upon it—that huge system of egotism, which openly teaches that its sole motive-power is self-interest, and which, sternly consistent with itself, grinds out with calm indifference its awful results of prosperous heartlessness and degraded or wrathful wretchedness.

In that condition of things Herbert Spencer is willing that the world should abide, because, forsooth, by virtue of "the survival of the fittest," he fancies that a better condition of things must grind itself out in the future. From it John Stuart Mill took refuge in socialism, common ownership of land and equal distribution of its products. And why this extreme? Because he knew no God, and therefore looked forward to human society without God—a world in which conscience and moral principle would be null, in which, therefore, there would be no real rights and no real duties, and in which, consequently, police regulation, the only preservative of life in the fatalistic struggle, must take hold of the entire social organization and drill it into communism!

From both these extremes, the one as false and as repulsive as the other, and both of them the logical alternatives of a world without God, the Holy Father leads to a true solution, of a world with God—humanity seen in the light of God, human passions controlled by the law of God, human energies directed by the will of God, human relations chastened by the love of God, and human conditions sweetened and beautified by the life and spirit of the God-man. Christendom was the first organization of human society on sound principles in the path of true civilization, and Christendom the world must continue to be, and must more and more perfectly become unto the end, if God's plan, which is the only plan of human welfare, is to be wrought out. And wrought out it shall be, notwithstanding the temporary set-back of the epoch now drawing to a close—the epoch whose resistance to God and his Christ has

strewn the world with such wreck of humanity. For let it not be imagined, says the Holy Father, as some foolishly assert, that the aim of the Church is only the other world. On the contrary, she seeks the welfare of mankind in their earthly dwelling-place as well as in their eternal home; the decency, comfort and prosperity of their sojourn here as well as the bliss of their hereafter, and she proves in all the history of Christian civilization how truly St. Paul says that "piety is useful unto all things, having the promise both of the life that now is, and of that which is to come."

But, human nature and human passions and human life being what they are, religious convictions and moral influences would not, by themselves, suffice to regulate human actions and secure justice. For this, civil authority must co-operate with the Divine authority, the human law with the law of God. In the next place, therefore, the Holy Father shows the part which the state must take in effecting sound social adjustments.

Here, again, he is met not only by the "*laissez-faire*" economists, who wish the State to keep its hands off their own sweet liberty and their own loudly-asserted rights, but even by many devout Catholics, who, either through exaggerated apprehensions of the godlessness of the State, or through well-founded indignation at excesses perpetrated against religion by existing governments, have formulated a theory of absolute non-intervention in social questions as the only safe policy to hold the State to. Only the other day the Catholic Congress of Angers formulated resolutions in this sense, in opposition to the resolutions demanding State intervention which had just previously been passed by the Catholic Congress at Liège. Gently and considerately, but firmly, the Holy Father solves the dispute by declaring unequivocally in favor of wisely-regulated State intervention.

The non-intervention party have been used to say that the State is only a *gendarme;* and in our own country we have often heard it asserted by over-extreme Jeffersonians or by over-timid Christians that civil authority must be strictly kept within the limits of police duty. Not such the teaching of Leo XIII. He shows that the field of governmental responsibility is a very wide one.

"The first duty, therefore, of the rulers of the State should be to make sure that the laws and institutions, the general character and administration of the commonwealth, shall be such as to produce of themselves public well-being and private prosperity. This is the proper office of wise statesmanship and the work of the heads of the State. Now a State chiefly prospers and flourishes by morality, by well-regulated family life, by respect for religion and justice, by the moderation and equal distribution of public bur-

dens, by the progress of the arts and of trade, by the abundant yield of the land—by everything which makes the citizens better and happier. Here, then, it is in the power of a ruler to benefit every order of the State, and amongst the rest to promote in the highest degree the interests of the poor; and this by virtue of his office, and without being exposed to any suspicion of undue interference—for it is the province of the commonwealth to consult for the common good."

Yet that the right of interference has its bounds, he shows very clearly:

"We have said that the State must not absorb the individual or the family; both should be allowed free and untrammelled action as far as is consistent with the common good and the interest of others."

"If the citizens of a State—that is to say, the families—on entering into association and fellowship, experienced at the hands of the State hindrance instead of help, and found their rights attacked instead of being protected, such association were rather to be repudiated than sought after."

"Whenever the general interest or any particular class suffers, or is threatened with, evils *which can in no other way be met*, the public authority must step in to meet them."

Then, after enumerating the several kinds of injustice to which the laboring classes may be subjected:

"In these cases there can be no question that, within certain limits, it would be right to call in the help and authority of the law. The limits must be determined by the nature of the occasion which calls for the law's interference—the principle being this—that the law must not undertake more, or go further, than is required for the remedy of the evil or the removal of the danger."

In regard to legislation which aims at correcting evils and repressing dangers, he utters a warning full of prudence:

"But every precaution should be taken not to violate the rights of individuals and not to make unreasonable regulations under the pretence of public benefit. For laws only bind when they are in accordance with right reason, and therefore with the eternal law of God."

Knowing how prone governments are, once they have taken a matter in hand, to push their control of it farther and farther, he urges that disputes should rather be referred to boards of arbitration formed by employers and workmen themselves. And in regard to such voluntary organizations in general, he gives an advice as wise as it is beautifully expressed:

"Let the State watch over these societies of citizens united together in the exercise of their right; but let it not thrust itself

into their peculiar concerns and their organization; for things move and live by the soul within them, and they may be killed by the grasp of a hand from without."

The Holy Father's treatment of this delicate and important question is an admirable illustration both of the philosophic breadth of his principles and of his conservative caution in their application to existing conditions. He shows how firm is his grasp on all that is true both in the theory which would extend governmental prerogatives to the utmost and in that which would hold them within the narrowest limits. Both theories have in them much that is right, and each of them is apt to err by being one-sided and extreme. He takes the middle ground and holds the balance with just equilibrium.

And to emphasize still more forcibly the measure of truth which lies on the one side and on the other, he states in terms of unmistakable clearness the end and purpose of governments:

"The safety of the commonwealth is not only the first law, but it is a government's whole reason of existence. . . . The object of the administration of the State should be, not the advantage of the ruler, but the benefit of those over whom he rules."

The domain of governmental rights and duties in general being thus sufficiently determined, he next inquires what ought to be the attitude and the action of the State towards the poor and the working classes. Concerning these important questions, he lays down the following propositions:

First. "To the State the interests of all are equal, whether high or low."

Second. In the body of citizens, the poor "are by far the majority."

Third. In the providing of bodily and external commodities the co-operation of the laboring classes is so important "that it may be truly said that it is only by the labor of the workingman that States grow rich."

Finally, while all rights must be religiously respected, "still, when there is a question of protecting the rights of individuals, the poor and helpless have a claim to special consideration."

From all these reasons he concludes that wage-earners "should be specially cared for and protected by the commonwealth."

This is a legislative principle of immense importance. How far the course of legislation in our country or any other has thus far been in accordance with it we do not need here to inquire. There is something startlingly suggestive of sad and serious reflection in the picture of the world from this standpoint which the Holy Father sketches in these few pregnant lines:

"On the one side there is the party which holds the power be-

cause it holds the wealth; which has in its grasp all labor and all trade, which manipulates for its own benefit and its own purposes all the sources of supply, and which is powerfully represented in the councils of the State itself. On the other side there is the needy and powerless multitude, sore and suffering, and always ready for disturbance."

Yet even when the struggle has to be carried on with such odds as these, our sympathies must not be permitted to warp our judgment. There are rights on both sides, and the balance of justice must be held even. The Holy Father does not for a moment forget that no wrong must be done, even for the attainment of any right; that should injustice be done to the rich, whatsoever might be the motive, nothing but harm could redound to the commonwealth, and to the laboring classes themselves. Were the rights of property imperilled in regard to the rich, there would be nothing to secure them even in regard to the poor. Were public order to be left at the mercy of the multitude, even when they arise to assert their unquestionable rights, then the strong arm of the law, to which they need to look for aid, would be powerless even in their behalf. Were demagogues left free to stir up the suffering multitudes to outlawry and violence, history tells us on many a bloody page what devastation might be expected at the hands of mob-despotism. Against all these extremes he shows that it is clearly the duty of the State to provide wisely and to guard firmly.

Nor does he at all intimate that the possession of great wealth is necessarily an evil thing or evidence of injustice. This would be to exaggerate the Gospel teaching and to close one's eyes to innumerable facts of experience. He who acquires great wealth by selfish and heartless means, and uses or hoards it for selfish and heartless ends, is a public evil and ought to be dealt with as such. But he who has acquired it by industries and enterprises which are honorable and useful to the public, and who uses it for ends of a similar character, may be not only blameless but highly commendable in the sight of both God and men. As the Holy Father puts it:

"It is one thing to have a right to the possession of money, and another to have a right to use money as one pleases."

The former cannot be questioned; the latter cannot be admitted.

"Whoever has received from the Divine bounty a large share of blessings, whether they be external and corporeal or gifts of the mind, has received them for the purpose of using them for the perfecting of his own nature, and, at the same time, that he may employ them, as the minister of God's Providence, for the benefit of others."

But experience shows too sadly that the rich are in very great

danger of forgetting this principle, of regarding their wealth as absolutely their own, of believing that they are free to use it as they please. Hence the frequent warnings of Holy Writ about the danger of riches.

Experience also shows that such a disposition in regard to wealth almost inevitably engenders a spirit of hard-heartedness in regard to the condition of the laboring poor by whose exertions it is accumulated. Hence the outcry all the world over that the condition of the laboring poor stands sorely in need of amelioration, and that since facts prove that the wealthy cannot be trusted to see to it themselves, then it must be accomplished by organized endeavor on the part of the laboring classes, and, where this falls short, by legislative enactments prompted by humanity and justice.

Among the matters of this kind which the Holy Father urges upon the attention of governments, and towards which it is gratifying to notice that the attention of nearly all the governments in Christendom is now being directed, there are two on which he dwells especially, the observance of Sunday and the question of wages.

In the name both of religion and of humanity, he insists that industrial greed should not be permitted to encroach on that repose from labor which both the law of nature and the law of God demand that the laborer should have one day in seven. He is careful to add this important warning, the need of which becomes, alas, steadily greater in our own country:

"This rest from labor is not to be understood as mere idleness; much less must it be an occasion of spending money and of vicious excess, as many would desire it to be; but it should be rest from labor, consecrated by religion."

As to the question of wages, he had said in an earlier part of the Encyclical:

"Doubtless, before we can decide whether wages are adequate, many things have to be considered; but rich men and masters should remember this: that to exercise pressure for the sake of gain upon the indigent and the destitute, and to make one's profit out of the need of another, is condemned by all laws, human and divine."

At this stage of the argument, therefore, he repudiates, as utterly inadmissible, the theory too commonly held by the hitherto prevalent school of political economy, that wages are a matter of absolutely free agreement between capital and labor. He goes on to show that there might be agreements about wages which it would not only be a crime for capital to impose, but even a crime for

labor to accept. The following lines demand careful and most serious consideration:

"The preservation of life is the bounden duty of each and all, and to fail therein is a crime. It follows that each one has a right to procure what is required in order to live, and the poor can procure it in no other way than by work and wages.

"Let it be granted, then, that, as a rule, workman and employer should make free agreements, and, in particular, should freely agree as to wages; nevertheless, there is a dictate of nature more imperious and more ancient than any bargain between man and man, that the remuneration must be enough to support the wage-earner in reasonable and frugal comfort. If, through necessity or fear of a worse evil, the workman accepts harder conditions because an employer or a contractor will give him no better, he is the victim of force and injustice."

This enunciation of the regulative principle of wages is one of the most striking and important propositions in all this remarkable Encyclical. It cuts with trenchant force the knot of a difficulty which has occasioned controversies innumerable, not only among political economists but even among Christian moralists. How far the relation of wages to the cost of living is a matter of justice, and at what point it ceases to belong to justice and becomes a matter of charity, is a question on which writers of respectability have seriously differed. The declaration of the Holy Father, that justice demands that wages shall be sufficient to support the laborer in frugal comfort, is startlingly decisive.

But he goes further still. He refers to other "dictates of nature" no less imperative. To the laborer's self, he adds his wife and his children. In treating the first part of his subject he had laid down the principle that

"It is indisputable that all are at full liberty either to follow the counsel of Jesus Christ as to virginity or to enter into the bonds of marriage."

To this he had added the correlative principle:

"It is a most sacred law of nature that a father must provide food and all necessaries for those whom he has begotten."

Now, therefore, in treating the question of wages, without further argument and as a matter of course, he merges the support of these dependent beings with the support of the workman himself, and supposes wages to be sufficient "to enable him to maintain himself, his wife and his children in reasonable comfort."

Here there will doubtless still be found room for controversy as to whether the Holy Father extends the obligation of justice so far as this. It is not my place to attempt to settle the question. But is well to remark that the Holy Father, in taking as the basis

of solution "what is required in order to live," is not speaking of the "economic man" of the school of Manchester and Malthus, but of man such as all the world knows him, with all his natural instincts, needs and obligations. Now, such a man will, as a rule, be married before twenty-five. It is best for himself and for the community that he should be. As a rule, he will have three or four children to feed and clothe and educate, before the oldest of them will be able to help in the support of the family. Nature evidently demands that in calculating "what is required in order to live," this all-important fact should not be overlooked.

The Holy Father never loses sight of the fact that, in the practical determination of figures, circumstances of places and persons, of industries and values, must be carefully taken into consideration. Hence he does not venture beyond the presentation of general principles. But it is by these that just solutions must in all local or individual cases be decided. And what he, above all, insists upon is, that neither labor nor the laborer must be degraded from the dignity with which nature and God have invested them. The laborer is a child of God, and must not be turned into "a mere instrument for making money." Labor has been ennobled in the life of "the Carpenter of Nazareth," and it must not be turned into a condition of misery or the badge of a degraded class. Every human being who is not to be a parasite on humanity is expected to labor in some way for the common good, and is entitled in return, to a support suitable to his work and to the station in which nature, together with his merit or the merit of his family, has placed him. This is the simple equity of the law of nature. The Pope has said no more, and neither he nor nature can be satisfied with less.

Wages must, of course, largely depend upon values. The greater the value produced by a day's work, the larger ought to be the wages paid for it. But value or price is largely at the mercy of competitive production; and experience shows that when competition runs high, producers will endeavor to undersell their competitors by underpaying their employees. This forces other employers to do the same. The workers then seek to protect their rights by strikes. But the employers answer, very naturally, that they are forced to lower wages by the action of competitive producers; that they must keep wages low or go out of business; that the only way to restore wages to a proper level is to hinder and reverse the action of those who initiate the system of ruinous competition and unjust wages. It is at the root and beginning, that the evil must be stopped, else either the whole class of producers are forced into the same manner of action, or they must retire from the field of industry and leave the monopoly of pro-

duction in the hands of those who least deserve to hold it. In this argumentation there is unquestionably much truth. It is the only argument that all will accept in favor of a system of protection, which, then is equivalent to boycotting those who offer goods at unfairly low prices by paying unfairly low wages for their production.

But, while it is manifest that every country ought in this way to protect its own producers and its own workers against unfair competition, the cure of the evil will not be reached till international agreements of the kind are arrived at. The public morality of Christian civilization renders it imperative that "starvation wages" should not be tolerated anywhere. Each country is bound to see to this within its own limits; and should any nation be delinquent, and thus generate ruinous competition from which the people of other nations must suffer, then there ought to be international compacts and sanctions to correct the evil at its source. The civilization of our day is characterized by international congresses which have brought about governmental agreements on various practical points, greatly to the convenience of human intercourse. It is to be hoped that the day is not far distant when a congress of all civilized governments will be held to arrive at international agreements about economic conditions, and especially about the question of wages. Such is the aim of our great world-bishop, the head of the only world-wide organization on earth. May it ere long be realized.

Meanwhile, strikes, boards of arbitration, and national legislation, are the only available means for bringing about proper adjustments. But strikes, while often justifiable, are commonly liable to abuses of many kinds, and frequently redound to the greater injury of the workers themselves. Hence, the Pope is naturally anxious that safer means, and especially judicious legislation, should be resorted to, in order to remove causes of just complaint, and thus render strikes unnecessary. It is a conviction to which, after the experience of recent years, people are coming in nearly every country of the world; and it may well be hoped that the forcibly expressed desire of the Holy Father, so entirely coinciding with the wish of lovers of justice and good order everywhere, will powerfully conduce to bring popular sentiment and governmental action on the subject to a speedy focus.

This part of his subject is closed by a paragraph full of practical sagacity, in which he urges on governments the advisableness of encouraging and aiding the working classes to become property-holders. This supposes economy and sobriety on their part, which ought in every way to be fostered for their good and for the public welfare; it elevates the worker; it breaks down the odious walls of

caste; it diffuses popular contentment, and binds all classes to their country with bonds of more loyal devotedness. Thus, he reaches again the conclusion arrived at, in his refutation of socialism, that what the working classes need and really desire, and what can alone solidly improve their condition, is not the abolition of private property, but its general acquisition. This is precisely the conclusion wrought out by Mr. Rae in his "Contemporary Socialism." Hence, his practical corollary, identical with that of the Holy Father:

"Then the business of social reform at present ought to be to facilitate the acquisition of private property; to multiply the opportunities of industrial investment open to the laboring classes, and to devise means for credit, for saving, for insurance, and the like."

It is comforting to learn from our latest census returns that such is the condition of things really developing in this country. The proportion of the population holding property, whether in land, in savings-bank deposits, in building associations, in business, or industrial enterprises, in insurance policies, or in whatever other form, seems to be steadily on the increase. We are yet far from a Utopian condition; there yet remains much to be remedied and improved; but facts show that the endeavor can be made in hopefulness and not in despair.

After thus fully treating of the part which the Church and the State must take in remedying social and economic evils, the Holy Father dwells at considerable length on the part which workingmen themselves must have in bringing about the result through the potent instrumentality of judicious association. In former times, he says, this end was attained by the Artificers' Guilds then existing. But their methods, he recognizes, could not be effective now. Forms of association must grow from existing social conditions and be conformable to them. The Guilds passed away with the conditions which engendered them. Associations must now take shape and methods from the social conditions now existing. Thus, the Holy Father shows the absurdity of the oft-repeated charge that the Church would, if she could, recast everything in a mediæval mould.

He then goes on to assert and to prove, more strongly perhaps than any Pope has ever done, the inalienable right of association for the attainment of all lawful ends. He bases this right on the same natural principle which is the foundation of civil society itself, and declares that no State has a right to prohibit it.

Under this right, however, associations must not be allowed to take refuge, which are contrary to morality, religion, or equity in

their aims or methods or plan of organization. Such they are, he shows, "when they are in the hands of invisible leaders; when they are managed on principles incompatible with Christianity and the public well-being; and when they do their best to get into their hands the whole field of labor, and to force workmen either to join them or starve." He shows that, to a conscientious workingman, membership in such an association becomes a galling enslavement, from which he would gladly escape if he dared to do so. The escape must be given him in governmental repression of such abuses, as incompatible with the public good, and in the determination of workingmen to cast off such thraldom, and to form associations in which they can retain their freedom, their conscience, and their self-respect. On this latter course, the more manly and Christian one, the Holy Father especially insists; and he goes on to show how, while aiming at economic justice, they should safeguard their own interests without detriment to the rights and interests of others, and should, above all, foster among themselves that spirit of Christian morality and religion which is the only sure foundation of social welfare.

He gives special approval and blessing to those zealous Christians and true lovers of their country and of humanity who, in various parts of the world, have come together to study these social problems in the light of history and of Christianity, and to further such action, on the part of governments and of the working classes themselves, as best seems to promise remedy for existing ills. He foretells that such endeavors are sure to redound to beneficial results.

"Such mutual associations among Catholics are certain to be productive, in no small degree, of prosperity to the State. It is not rash to conjecture the future from the past. Age gives way to age, but the events of one century are wonderfully like those of another, for they are directed by the Providence of God, who over-rules the course of history in accordance with His purposes in creating the race of man."

It is indeed a comfort to be reminded that not the Demon of Gold but the Almighty Father of the human race holds the helm of things, and that however far from His way the march of events and the tendencies of human endeavor may sometimes seem to have strayed, gently and hiddenly, but surely, His plan is certain to be worked out at last, and His plan is all for his creatures' good. The whining of those who seem to believe that not God but the Devil guides the course of history,—and such seems to be the conviction of some very good people everywhere,—does no good at all. It only serves to discourage zeal, and to excite contempt for religion in practical men. Happily, there is nothing of

the sort in this great Encyclical. It is a bugle-blast of hope, a bugle-call to energetic action. It is in sympathy with the demand for social reform everywhere heard, and the generous efforts in that direction everywhere noticeable. It will put new courage into all men who believe that religion ought to be the chief factor in the great movement, and it supplies them with many wise principles for their guidance. Future generations will look back to it and bless it, and bless the great Pope whose teachings it so worthily crowns.

THE MYSTERY OF CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE.

Τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν.—Eph. v., 32.

"MARRIAGE a mystery!" exclaimed the flippant Erasmus. "What is there mysterious in so ordinary a thing as the union of a male to a female?"[1] "As matrimony has existed since the beginning of the world," says Martin Luther, "and still continues in use amongst the heathen, there is no foundation for the belief that it is a sacrament of the New Law and the exclusive property of the Church. For the marriages of the patriarchs were as holy as ours, and the marriages of unbelievers are no less valid than are those of the faithful; yet they are not supposed to be sacraments."[2]

John Calvin, too, added his surly growl to swell the chorus by proclaiming that marriage was no more sacramental than "house-building, farming, shoe-making or barbering."[3]

Thus did the great and holy Reformers tear the mask off one more of Rome's mummeries. For ages had the Pope of Rome deluded an ignorant world into believing that the conjugal union of a Christian man and woman was an awful mystery surrounded and instinct with supernatural grace and dignity. But no popish

---

[1] Apud Bellarm. De Sac. Mat., c. ii.

[2] "Cum matrimonium fuerit ab initio mundi, et apud infideles adhuc permaneat, nullæ subsunt rationes ut sacramentum novae legis et solius ecclesiæ possit dici. Non minus enim erant matrimonia patrum sancta quam nostra, nec minus vera infidelium quam fidelium; nec tamen in eis ponunt sacramentum."—De Captiv. Babl. Eccles.

[3] "Et agricultura, architectura, sutrina, tonstrina ordinationes sunt Dei legitimæ, nec tamen Sacramenta sunt."

trick could beguile an Erasmus or a Luther or a Calvin, men who claimed the right of examining mysteries in the bright light of their own reason.

Many years ago, when the present writer was a very small boy, he received a kaleidoscope as a Christmas gift from the good St. Nicholas. Hour after hour passed by as he gazed in ecstasy at the endless panorama of gorgeous colors and symmetrical forms revolving before his eyes; but finally the novelty of the thing having worn away, his Yankee instinct of irreverent curiosity gained the upper hand and he broke the magic toy "to see what it was all made of." Alas! he found only a few pieces of broken glass. That little instrument which the genius of Sir David Brewster had sublimated into a thing of surpassing beauty lay before him irreparably ruined, fit only to be swept away with the other rubbish of the nursery. We lost our kaleidoscope, but we gained a valuable lesson in practical philosophy which has often since stood us in great stead.

For what had Sir David done but put into the hands of children a philosophic toy which exhibited in miniature the workings of our Almighty Creator, of Him who with a handful of unsightly elements produces the endless phenomena of the universe? And whenever in our attempts to penetrate the veil and reach to the essence of things we disfigure this beautiful creation, when we destroy the color of the rose and the lustre of the diamond is it proper that we should conclude that color is a deception and light nothing but a fraud? Is God then to be adored simply as the Creator of oxygen and carbon, and not equally as the framer of those mysterious laws which out of a few simple elements have built up a glorious world? In opposition to the impious iconoclasm of the reformers, the Catholic continues to cry out with St. Paul: "*Great is this mystery*" of Christian matrimony! Great "*in Christ and in His Church!*"

Nor are we alone in proclaiming that marriage underwent a mysterious, sacramental change under the transforming hand of Christ. The whole world confesses and every child can see that there is an immense difference between marriage *in Christ and in His Church* and the polygamous alliances of the patriarchs of old or the unstable unions of the heathen. To deny that our Lord Jesus thoroughly reformed and transformed, sealed and sanctified the conjugal bond is to rob Him of the glory of one of the divinest miracles He wrought. At Cana of Galilee He worked a stupendous miracle which revolutionized human society; He changed water into wine! We do not refer to that transubstantiation of the material element which He effected at His mother's request. We regard this with St. Epiphanius[1] as a mere symbol

[1] Haeresis, 51, c. 30.

of the far more important change which He had in contemplation with respect to that institution which forms the corner-stone of the social fabric of mankind.

We are in the habit of speaking of *the* Epiphany of our Lord, as though there were but one. But Holy Church reminds us in her sublime anthem on the 6th of January that there were *three* Epiphanies, that is, our Saviour was on three several occasions manifested to the world, and each time in a new character. His first Epiphany was in His office of Enlightener of the intellect. After thirty years of seclusion He reappeared in the waters of the Jordan as the Giver of sanctity. His third Epiphany was at the wedding feast where He appeared as the Reformer of society. And badly did society need a reformation. Our surprise at beholding our Lord opening His public career amidst the rout and tumult of a wedding is increased by noticing how mysteriously He speaks and acts. He seems to be absorbed by anxious thoughts; and those thoughts and anxieties are evidently quite different from the motherly solicitudes of Mary, to whom He makes the strange answer (speaking as if roused from a deep reverie); *Quid mihi et tibi est mulier? Nondum venit hora mea.*" Certainly at that moment the minds of Jesus and of Mary were engrossed by very different concerns,—Mary's full of compassion at the embarrassment of her hosts, our Lord's filled with grief as He contemplated the utter degradation into which the lusts of men had dragged a sacred institution. Upon His mother's insistence, He granted her the favor which she sought. It was a slight miracle to the Almighty One, and was accomplished in the twinkling of an eye. The time for achieving the greater transformation had not yet come; it was to be the toilsome work of many a century. Hence not idly is it stated in Holy Writ that not only Mary and Her Divine Son were present at this wedding, but *His disciples also;* for, no heavier task was about to be imposed on St. Peter and his venerable colleagues than the conversion of Jewish and Pagan into Christian marriages and the preservation of the state, when sanctified, against the brutal lusts of barbarians and the blasphemous sneers of the Luthers and Calvins. For nineteen centuries this has been the mighty work of every Christian priest, from the Vicar of Christ to the humblest missionary among wild nomads; and difficult it is to determine which has the harder task, whether the Pope who has to deal with a Henry VIII. or the missionary who has to teach the savage that men must not live like the lower animals. The doctrine which, incomparably more than any other, has christianized and civilized human society has been this of the inviolable and mysterious sanctity of matrimony. The wildest Indian who roves the plains is metamorphosed into a civilized man

directly he has mastered this vital doctrine, or rather directly the doctrine has mastered him. That society, on the other hand, be it ever so goodly to the eye, is rotten at the core and is relapsing into barbarism which is no longer founded upon Christian matrimony, one and inseparable.

It is not our intention to follow up the wild vagaries of modern theorists on marriage, or to undertake a needless defence of the Catholic doctrine. This article of the teachings of Holy Church is, beyond all others, *justified in itself*. It has been deemed, however, that a plain exposition of the Catholic position on the subject may be of interest and benefit to many who have not made a systematic study of Catholic theology.

I. Marriage, in the creed and general practice of the Roman Catholic Church, differs from all other marriages in a three-fold respect. First, it is absolutely indissoluble save by death. Secondly, it is essentially religious and sacramental. Thirdly, and as a logical consequence of its sacred character, it is subject to the supervision and legislative authority of the Church. These three characteristics of Catholic matrimony are so intimately bound up together that they may justly be said to be *one;* for, reason and long experience demonstrate that they stand or fall together. Without entering into the scholastic question as to the *matter* and *form* of this sacrament, it is advisable to keep before our eyes the close connection (which St. Augustine seems to have been the first to bring out into strong relief) between the *indissolubility* and the *sacramentality* of Christian matrimony.[1] This connection may be defined to be one of cause and effect, or of the end and the means. The end which our Lord set before Him in the reformation of marriage was to make it conform to the original conception in the mind of the Creator, the inseparable union of one man and one woman. The means which His wisdom devised to the attainment of this end was the fortifying of the unsteady human will with supernatural grace. Having thus sanctified and fortified the marriage state, He committed it to the custody of His Church, together with the other sacred ordinances of His religion. This is the sense in which we understand St. Augustine's often repeated dictum, that the *bonum sacramenti* of Christian matrimony is its indissoluble bond.

II. It is surely unnecessary to waste many words in demonstrating that it was the fixed resolve of Christ to sweep away polygamy and divorce from the face of the earth. With the single exception of

[1] The circumstance that this word *sacramentality* has not yet made its appearance on the page of any English dictionary simply indicates that our lexicographers have not been Catholics, and consequently have felt no need of the term. We ought to have no scruple in employing a word which has the sanction of good Catholic usage.

the Holy Eucharist, there is no point of doctrine so forcibly or so frequently inculcated in the New Testament as the unity and indissolubility of matrimony. In addition to the texts of St. Matthew, St. Mark and St. Luke, we have the vigorous utterances of St. Paul, and these passages are so well-known that we need not repeat them here. Those, however, whose first impulse it is, in discussing a question, to raise objections, may inquire how we reconcile the received doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church with the famous passage, Matt. xix., 9, which, it may be claimed, permits a dissolution of the marital bond in case of adultery. We shall limit ourselves to remarking: 1st. That there is no intimation in the alleged text that adultery dissolves the bond. It is merely stated that fornication is a sufficient ground for *putting away* the wife, which the Roman Catholic Church has always maintained. The unfaithful spouse forfeits every *right* which he had acquired by marriage, but his sin does not release him from any of his *obligations*. He is now thrown completely upon the mercy of the offended consort, who may either condone the infidelity or separate from the culprit eternally, nor is it in the power of Church or State to force a renewal of the conjugal relations against the will of the outraged party. Nay, it has at times been held that a condoning of adultery is a virtual participation in the crime. Hence, the immense difference between separation on account of adultery and separation for any other reason. Adultery is the only cause which can justify a final and permanent *putting away*. All other reasons may give rise to temporary suspensions of the conjugal relation, but the suspension ceases upon the cessation of the cause. If the wife become deranged in mind, the husband will commit her to an asylum; but this is not *putting* her *away*, for his heart goes with her, and his sympathy with her in her affliction but increases his affection. If on account of "incompatible tempers" they break up house and go back to their respective mothers, their childishness does not dissolve the vinculum. Sober reflection, the expostulations of friends and the ghostly admonitions of their pastor will sooner or later induce them to come together again and have sense. The Church, therefore, is in perfect accord with our Saviour in teaching that fornication is the only cause which can justify the *putting away* of a spouse, and that the wife who is thus put away is still a wife, so that she must "*remain unmarried or be reconciled to her husband*" (1 Cor. vii., 11). "*Whilst her husband liveth, she shall be called an adulteress, if she be with another man*" (Rom. vii. 3); "*and he that shall marry her that is put away committeth adultery*" (Matt. xix., 9). The clause in St. Matthew, therefore, does not in the

least mitigate the precise and absolute utterances of the other passages of the New Law.[1]

2d. We are not, of course, pretending after the fashion of Protestants that we have arrived at certitude in the interpretation of this obscure passage by any superior critical acumen or by a special inspiration of the Holy Ghost. The law of Christ is not our private property, but the inheritance of the Church; nor has Holy Church been compelled to wait for our judgment before determining with exactness the meaning of our Lord's decree. From the earliest ages the voice of the Church has been clear and unfaltering in pronouncing that adultery does not dissolve the marital bond. Without burdening our pages with unnecessary texts from Fathers and Councils, we shall content ourselves with quoting the celebrated passage of the Apostolic Father, Hermas, found in Book second, Commandment fourth, of the "Shepherd." "Permit me," says the writer, to his guardian "angel of repentance," "to ask you a few questions." "Say on," said he. And I said to him, "Sir, if any one has a wife who trusts in the Lord, and if he detect her in adultery, does the man sin if he continue to live with her?" And he said to me, "As long as he remains ignorant of her sin, the husband commits no transgression in living with her. But if the husband know that his wife has gone astray, and if the woman does not repent, but persists in her fornication, and yet the husband continues to live with her, he also is guilty of her crime, and a sharer in her adultery." And I said to him, "What then, sir, is the husband to do if his wife continues in her vicious practices?" And he said, "The husband should put her away *and remain by himself. But if he put away his wife and marry another, he also commits adultery.*" And I said to him, "What if the woman put away should repent and wish to return to her husband, shall she not be taken back by her husband?" And he said to me, "Assuredly. If the husband do not take her back he sins, and brings a great sin upon himself, for he ought to take back the sinner who has repented. But not frequently. For there is but one repentance to the servants of God. In case, therefore, that the divorced wife may repent, the husband ought not to marry another, when his wife has been put away. In this

---

[1] If, with Tischendorf, we drop the *εἰ* before the *μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ* the last vestige of a difficulty will vanish, as the allusion will then be evidently to a concubine. This interpretation of the clause will grow in favor with the gradual acceptance of this emendation of the Greek text. See the *Synopsis Evangelica*, p. 110. It has been objected to this interpretation that the clause would not be germane to the subject-matter, for the question under discussion did not regard concubinage, but marriage. But in any sense the clause was merely parenthetical, and so little affected the general proposition that the other Evangelists omitted it altogether.

matter man and woman are to be treated exactly in the same way."[1]

It is worthy of notice that Hermas does not inquire whether the separated parties be free to marry again. He is evidently convinced that they are not. He has doubts as to the propriety of living with an unrepenting adulteress and as to the duty of taking back the sinner if repentant, but no doubt whatsoever as to the continuance of the vinculum. A doctrine introduced thus incidentally comes upon us with much greater force than if it had been made the subject of a formal discussion. The questions which the author put directly to the "Shepherd" were the *quaeriturs* of a theologian; the tacit assumption of the indissolubility of marriage, even in case of adultery, was the unconscious witnessing of a disciple of the Apostles to the primitive faith of the Church. Certainly neither St. Augustine nor St. Thomas nor the Council of Trent has laid down the orthodox tenet with greater precision than this Father who was taught the Law of Christ from the mouth of the Apostles.

3d. The fact that the Eastern churches permit the husband of an adulteress to marry again during the life-time of the divorced woman, instead of weakening, only confirms the Roman position. For the practice is of comparatively late introduction and called forth earnest protests from the Greek Fathers. It is a well established fact that the enforcement of the matrimonial laws of Christ is the office and prerogative of the See of St. Peter. No inferior authority has availed to assert them with any success. The imperial legislation, being the outgrowth of paganism, never adopted the Christian doctrine of matrimony, and as the Greek Church gradually broke away from the Holy See it came more and more under the influence of the civil law, until it finally surrendered the cause of Christ to the State. Nevertheless, the superiority of the Roman doctrine has always remained before the eyes of the Greeks, as it does amongst our Protestant neighbors, as a sublime but unattainable ideal. In the course of the numerous and protracted negotiations for a reunion between the Eastern and Western churches this difference of custom never proved a stumbling-block. The Greeks more than once admitted the Western dogma in theory; but they have always lacked the vigor necessary to enforce it. The solitary objection on dogmatic grounds which we have been able to discover as advanced by any Greek against the Latin interpretation of Matt. xix. is found in the list of accusations drawn up against the Western church by Michael

[1] We give this important passage as translated by the Edinburgh editors.—*Apostolic Fathers*, p. 352.

Caerularius in the eleventh century.[1] But the very fact that this objection was first raised two centuries after the beginning of the Schism, merely evidences the degradation and degeneracy of the separated Greeks. Had the able and learned Photius dared join issue with Rome on the subject, he would have been only too glad to take advantage of so important a weapon; but he was too well versed in the writings of the ancients and also too sensible of the glaring inconsistency between the faith and the practice of his countrymen to breathe a syllable on so delicate a matter. In later times the Greeks have shown the greatest anxiety to evade any controversy upon the question; and they do so all the more earnestly because marriage amongst them having passed altogether out of the control of the church into the jurisdiction of the civil power, has become as unstable as it is in Protestant countries. We seek, therefore, no stronger confirmation of the truth of the Roman Catholic doctrine than is afforded by the present condition of marriage in countries which have separated themselves from its communion.[2]

III. We assume it as placed beyond doubt and controversy that our Lord allowed no dissolution of a marriage *ratum et consummatum*. It is to be observed, also, that He speaks, not as if introducing a new ordinance, but as enforcing a law never abrogated. In this connection we notice a remarkable difference of phraseology between St. Matthew's and St. Mark's narrative of our Saviour's conversation with the Pharisees. According to St. Matthew the Pharisees asked: "Why did Moses *command* to give a bill of divorce and to put away?" Christ answered: "Because Moses by reason of the hardness of your heart *permitted* you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so." According to St. Mark (c. x.) our Lord asked: "What did Moses *command* you?" The Pharisees answered: "Moses *permitted* to write a bill of divorce and to put away." The Mosaic legislation in Deuteronomy xxiv., was, therefore, at once a *command* and a *permission;* but the command was absolute, whilst the permission was merely passive, extorted by "hardness of heart." The subject-matter of the command, as St. Augustine has observed, was not to put away the wife, but that the wife should *not* be put away without receiving from the husband a formal bill of divorce. It was, says the saint, "In order that the

[1] Hergenrœther's Photius, v. iii., p. 823. We mention this because it is sometimes said that the Greeks *never* have objected to the Latin understanding of this passage. It is a case, however, of the exception confirming the rule, for the objection was never insisted upon.

[2] Read Perrone's remarks on the Greek Church in ch. 4 of the third volume *De Mat. Christ.*

thought of such a writing might moderate the rash anger of him who was getting rid of his wife; and, therefore, he who sought to interpose a delay in putting away, indicated, as far as he could to hard-hearted men, that he did not wish separation."[1] That is to say, we ought not to look upon the legislation of Moses as a relaxation of the original law of the unity and indissolubility of matrimony; much less, as a formal sanction of the custom of divorce. Quite the contrary; it was the aim of the great lawgiver to make divorce difficult and odious. Hence he put a twofold restriction upon it. He interposed the delay of a legal procedure; and he decreed (v. 4.) that the divorcing husband should be forever debarred from again taking the divorced woman to wife. All then that the Mosaic Law *commanded* was of a restrictive character; and the apparent toleration of divorce was merely the sufferance of an evil too inveterate to be at one sweep eradicated. But divorce was no more sanctioned than any of the other enormous evils at which God is said to have winked in times of ignorance (Acts xvii., 30). The marriage in Eden ever remained as the sole type recognized by Heaven and by healthy natural sentiment as the legitimate union of man and woman; and every deviation whether in the direction of divorce or of polygamy was essentially an evil to be attributed to "hardness of heart" and to be excused only on the plea of ignorance.

IV. It now remains to examine what provision was made by the Incarnate Wisdom to raise marriage from the degradation into which human passions had plunged it and to secure a permanent reform. The law alone had proved lamentably powerless; and had our Saviour contented Himself with a bare promulgation of the primeval law, He would have accomplished nothing. Nay, He would have left marriage in a worse condition than ever; for the old evils would have continued and the plea of ignorance could no longer be advanced. Here, if ever, was it necessary that where sin had abounded, grace should more abound. In this degraded institution human weakness clamored for divine aid. Nothing but the infusion of the Blood of Christ could purify the tainted fountain-head of humanity. And that Christ did pour into it the life-giving stream of His grace and bind it closely and mysteriously to His own Divine Person, that He "blessed" and "sanctified" it, and made it His, will not, we presume, be questioned by any one who confesses that He was something more than a mere preacher or law-giver. St. Paul was not making a rhetorical flourish, when he commanded the Christian to be married "*in the Lord.*" He intimated that the contract of matrimony was become

[1] St. Augustine on the Sermon on the Mount, chap. xiv.

an essentially religious matter, intimately bound up with the Christian worship. It belongs no longer to the category of natural things, to be compared with Calvin, to "house-building, farming, barbering or cobbling." "It becomes both men and women who marry," said the martyr Ignatius, "to form their union with the approval of the bishop, that their marriage may be according to God and not after their own lusts."[1] "Where shall we find words enough," cries Tertullian,[2] "fully to tell the happiness of that marriage which the Church cements, and the Oblation confirms, and the benediction signs and seals?" From the primitive ages of Christianity the marriage ceremony has been regarded as a religious rite: and the marriage state as one of consecration and benediction. The religious feature thoroughly permeates the contract, making it sacred and supernatural. We do not intend to entangle ourselves in polemics, but we wish to draw attention to the peculiar method adopted by a recent Protestant writer in treating this subject.[3] His dogmatic preposessions prevent him from finding in antiquity any foundation for the Catholic teaching that matrimony is a sacrament. Naturally it is not difficult for one who is determined beforehand not to admit the continuity of pure tradition to explain away the clearest evidences. This is, in fact, the main reason of the different results arrived at by Catholic and Protestant scholars. The former come to the study of Scriptures and the Fathers expecting to find them in full accord with the present teaching of the church; the latter just as anxious to discover a discrepancy. When this writer, in his very learned and interesting narrative of the ancient marriage ceremony, comes to speak of the formula of benediction employed, he notices that it is "a form on which it will be seen that the final benediction in the solemnization of matrimony in the English church is framed." We, however, notice that in this as in many other matters, the Anglican Church has left out the very kernel of the benediction, no doubt because too redolent of Romanism. When did any Protestant minister pronounce over the happy couple the following passage of the ancient prayer? "O God, who hast consecrated the state of matrimony to such an excellent mystery that in it Thou didst typify the Sacrament of Christ and the Church," etc. This formula does not, it is true, state in so many words that matrimony is one of the seven sacraments; but it comes too dangerously close to it to be allowed to stand in a Protestant prayer-book. Indeed the entire patristic phraseology regarding matrimony and its "mystery" and its "consecrations" and its "benedictions" and

---

[1] To Polycarp, c. 5.
[2] Ad uxorem b. ii., c. 8.
[3] Article "Marriage" in Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*.

"Oblations" and "cementings" and "signings and sealings" survives only in its proper seat, the liturgy of the Catholic Church.

V. We propose to devote the remainder of our space to the consideration of the text Eph., v. 32, which stands at the head of our article. Christ fortified marriage with supernatural grace, but does Scripture teach that He raised it to the dignity of a Sacrament? The Catholic will answer that St. Paul teaches it to be a Sacrament and a great one. "Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the Church. . . . They shall be two in one flesh (ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σαρκα μίαν). This is a great Sacrament. But I speak in Christ and in the Church (ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω εἰς Χριστὸν καί εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν)."

It is the peculiarity of this famous passage that it was considered to be as limpid as water until polemical writers fastened upon it. But during the last few hundred years it has received almost as many different interpretations as the words, "*This is My Body.*" There is probably no text in Holy Writ which better illustrates the difference between the Catholic and the Protestant exegesis of Scripture. The Catholic interpretation of the sacred writings grew steadily and quietly. It was not the outgrowth of controversy or excogitated for the purpose of warfare against existing opinions; on the contrary, Scripture was understood in the light of actual belief and practice. In the hands of Protestants, Holy Writ is essentially a weapon of offence against Catholicism. Texts of Scripture have been used as so many engines with which to batter down the traditional doctrine. The Catholic looks upon the Bible as the inheritance of the Church. When he reads it, his first impulse is not to seek therein passages wherewith to confound paganism or heresy, but such as serve to his own edification. This was certainly the method in which St. Paul himself employed the inspired word, for he has found meanings in it which are startling to modern criticism. We cannot, therefore, pretend to have much sympathy with the manner in which a distinguished Catholic expounder of this passage (whom we refrain through reverence from naming) treats the usual orthodox exposition of it. "This passage," he says, "by no means furnishes a *proof* that matrimony is one of the seven sacraments of the New Law. . . . Why adduce a *dubious* passage, at best, like the present, in *proof*," etc. Here is a writer who is evidently demoralized and panic-stricken. He speaks as if Scripture was to be used only as a quarry for polemical texts. Any passage which cannot be employed as a weapon against heresy he seems to regard as useless. Hence his insisting on *proofs*. What does he mean by pronouncing the passage *dubious?* Dubious to whom? Was it dubious to St. Augustine, or to St. Thomas, or to the Fathers of Trent?

Why should we pronounce a passage dubious which the Church, according to the Roman Catechism,[1] "confirmed by the authority of the Apostle," thinks that "nemini dubium esse debet?" When did ever pope, bishop or priest discourse upon Christian marriage without making prominent mention of this "dubious" passage? If it be the writer's meaning that the text is too involved and obscure to convict a heretic of error, this is another and a secondary consideration. One thing is perfectly certain, that the Catholic Church, founding herself upon "the authority of the Apostle," has always understood St. Paul to be referring to the sacramentality of marriage; nor is she likely at this late day to suit her interpretation of the passage to the convenience of polemical writers.

Having taken the pains to examine quite a number of Protestant commentaries on the subject, we are pleased to notice that the longer and deeper the question is investigated, the closer does the general interpretation approximate to that of the Catholic Church. We have noticed also that the commentators approach to the Catholic interpretation in direct proportion to the degree in which they have freed themselves from the baneful influence of the sixteenth century Reformers. This is, of course, to be expected; for it is only by studying the text with the calmness of the ancient Catholic writers that one can arrive at the understanding which prevailed before there were sectarian prejudices to sway the mind. Both Luther and Calvin exhausted the vials of their coarse language upon the "ignorant" and "blundering" Papists for "fabricating a new Sacrament" out of this text, which, they maintained, does not refer to marriage at all.[2] We will give Calvin's commentary *in extenso.*

"*Arcanum hoc magnum est, ego autem dico in Christo et in Ecclesia.*"

"We cannot avoid admiring the acuteness of the Papists, who conclude from the word mystery (*μυστήριον*) that marriage is one of the seven sacraments, as if they had the power of changing water into wine. They enumerate *seven* sacraments, while Christ has instituted no more than *two;* and to prove that matrimony is one of the seven, they produce this passage. On what grounds? Because the Vulgate has adopted the word *sacramentum* as a translation of the word mystery, which the Apostle uses. As if sacramentum did not frequently, among Latin writers, denote *mystery*, or as if *mystery* had not been the word employed by Paul in the same Epistle, when speaking of the calling of the Gentiles. But

[1] Pars. ii., chap. viii., 16.

[2] See Luther's *Capt. Babyl.*, and Calvin in his *Institutes* and in his *Commentary on Ephesians.* The above text of Calvin is from the latter work.

the present question is: Has marriage been appointed as a sacred symbol of the grace of God to declare and represent to us something spiritual, such as Baptism or the Lord's Supper? They have no ground for such an assertion, unless it be that they have been deceived by the double signification of a Latin word, or rather by their ignorance of the Greek language. If the simple fact had been observed that the word used by Paul is *mystery*, no mistake would ever have occurred. We see, then, the hammer and anvil with which they fabricated this sacrament. But they have given another proof of their indolence in not attending to the correction which is immediately added: *But I speak concerning Christ and the Church.*[1] He intended to give express warning that no man should understand him as speaking of marriage; so that his meaning is more fully expressed than if he had uttered the former sentiment without any exception. The *great mystery* is, that Christ breathes into the Church His own life and power. But who would discover here anything like a sacrament? The blunder arose from the grossest ignorance."

What the Apostle meant to say, then, according to this infallible Pope of Geneva, was to this effect, "They two shall be in one flesh. This is a great mystery. But I speak (not of marriage but) of Christ and the Church."

We shall limit ourselves to making a few remarks on this admirable piece of biblical exegesis. 1. It was neither Pope nor "papist" that translated μυστήριον by *sacramentum*. That translation was made in the very "purest" age of the Church, before the time of Tertullian. Hence it is difficult to read with equanimity the tirade of Bloomfield against "the shameful blunder of the Vulgate translator."[2] One would fancy that this man imagined it was Leo X. who made the translation for the sake of "fabricating" a new popish sacrament.

2. It is ridiculous to deny that St. Paul was pronouncing marriage to be a μυστήριον. What else was he speaking of but marriage and *Christian* marriage? Being ourselves Americans, we blush for our brethren in Princeton when we find the great Dr. Hodge servilely following in the footsteps of Calvin, and deciding that "it is not marriage, but the union between Christ and His Church, that Paul declares to be a μυστήριον and the Vulgate a *sacramentum*." Such a pronouncement from a learned man confirms us in our opinion, that there is a great deal of truth in Dr. Briggs'

---

[1] In order to extort this meaning, Calvin (imitating Luther) deliberately changes the *in* of the Apostle into *de*. He forgot to do so in his head line, which stands there to condemn him.

[2] *Recensio Synoptica*, vol. vii. p. 654.

famous thesis that it is advisable to call in the Church occasionally to help us out in understanding the Scriptures.

3. It is an entirely gratuitous assertion that the doctrine of the sacramentality of marriage was built upon any word or text of Scripture. Is it not more rational to believe that the doctrine, already taught and practiced, influenced the early translator in using the word *sacramentum* instead of *mysterium*? It has, moreover, been remarked time and again by hostile writers that the word *sacramentum* is used in Scripture and antiquity, sometimes in a large sense of things sacred or hidden, and at other times in its technical sense of a channel of divine grace. In fact, until the schoolmen invented the term *sacramentalia* there was no word to distinguish the Sacraments instituted by Christ from such other sacred signs and symbols as the Washing of Feet, the Taking of Solemn Vows or the Blessing of a Church. This, however, created no inconvenience to those who learned the Christian doctrine from the living Church. To the present day, the Greeks use the word μυστήριον in the larger sense of a *mystery*, and in the technical sense of the seven sacraments of the New Law; and if we took time to think, we could easily adduce many instances in which we do likewise. We can give a novel illustration of this in a work just published for the first time by Dr. Schulte. We refer to the Summa of Stephen of Tournay, one of the very earliest commentators on Gratian. On page 131 he tells us there are *seven* sacraments, and he names them correctly. On page 134 he startles us by observing that "some sacraments may be repeated, such as the anointing of the sick and the *dedication of churches;* others may not be repeated, as, for instance, Baptism, the *Consecration of Virgins* and the Ordination of Priests." A little attention to this pecularity of phraseology among the ancients would have preserved some Catholic writers from pronouncing rash judgments on the orthodoxy of the earliest canonists. They used the words *sacrament* and *mystery*, of all the sacred rites and symbols existing in the Church, and left it to their reader to learn elsewhere whether those rites were of divine institution with an annexed promise of grace or introduced by the Church as subsidiary means to the salvation of souls. So when St. Paul pronounces marriage to be a great *mystery* or *sacrament* of the Christian religion, we might have remained in doubt as to the manner in which it conveys grace, had not Holy Church taught us that it is a true sacrament of the New Law. It is, therefore, the doctrine which has determined the text, not the text which has "fabricated" the doctrine

4. If the Catholic "mistake" arose from ignorance that St. Paul wrote *mystery* instead of *sacramentum*, how are we to explain the fact that the Greeks who knew nothing of the word *sacramentum*

nevertheless hold with the Latins, that marriage is a sacrament, and a great one? The "ignorance" and the "blunder" and the "folly" and all the other complimentary expressions rebound upon the head of the rash man, who imagined that he alone possessed knowledge and wisdom. Calvin has had his day, and is dead; Catholic truth remains on its old foundation.

Let us now see how the passage is handled by Protestant writers who have approached the subject, not with the design of overturning Romanism, but in the honest endeavor of enlightening *themselves* as to its meaning. Dr. Barry, in Ellicott's New Testament, expounds as follows: "*This mystery is a great one.* The words apply to the type as well as to the anti-type. 1. The indissoluble and permanent sacredness of marriage, as all history shows, is a "mystery," that is, a secret of God's law, fully revealed in Christ alone. For in heathen, and, to some extent, even in Jewish thought, marriage was a contract, far less sacred than the indissoluble tie of blood; and wherever Christian principle is renounced or obscured, that ancient idea recurs in modern times." Rev. F. Meyrick (the same who wrote the article *Marriage* in Smith's "Dictionary") has the following exposition in Cook's "Commentary": "*This mystery is great.* The mystery is the analogy between the marriage-state and the spiritual union betwixt Christ and the Church. . . . But though no support can be derived from the passage for the theory that marriage is one of the sacraments of His Church, yet the holiness of the estate is evidenced by it. Marriage is no mere contract, but a religious rite."

Rückert, in Meyer's "Commentary" makes a very sensible observation. He "despairs of more precise explanation, as the passage stands forth in an abrupt form *merely as a hint thrown out for the more initiated.*" We believe he is entirely correct, and had we no other source of information than this bare text we should likewise pronounce it a mystic text "thrown out to the more initiated." But how different is this from the shallow dogmatism of Calvin!

Lastly we shall quote from a work just published; and we do it all the more willingly because the author is a professor in a Wesleyan College. We have often found a fairer treatment of dogmatic subjects in Evangelical writers than in those extremely High Anglicans whose prime article of faith seems to be hatred of the Pope. Professor Joseph Agar Beet in his "Commentary on Ephesians" (New York 1891) writes as follows:

"*This mystery* (same word in Rom. xi. 25): the marriage relation described in the foregoing quotation. See note under 1 Cor. iii., 4. *With reference to Christ and with reference to the Church:*[1]

[1] It is hardly necessary to remind the reader that the Revised Edition has corrected that stupid corruption of the Reformers of the *in* into *de*. Personally we

these represented as distinct objects of thought. It is needless to discuss here whether marriage is a sacrament; for this would involve a definition of the term.[1] Certainly, marriage cannot be put on a level with the two rites ordained by Christ for all His servants. But Paul's teaching here implies clearly its unchangeable sacredness. And this felt sacredness has ever found expression in acts of worship accompanying the marriage ceremony. Callous must they be who can enter the solemn obligations of wedlock without recognizing its divine sanction and sacred duties."

We have very little to animadvert upon these expositions of the text. If these writers have not found in it the Sacrament of Matrimony, this has been owing to more radical errors regarding the method of justification and the nature of sacraments in general. If ever they become "more initiated" they will surely adopt the Catholic interpretation of St. Paul's "abrupt hint."

We have now almost arrived at the end of our task, which has been, as we premised, a task rather of exposition than of proof. As we have never attempted the herculean labor of framing for ourselves a system of religion out of the Bible, we do not consider ourselves to be fit judges of what can and what can not be extracted with certitude from the letter of the sacred writings. The number of texts of Scripture dogmatically expounded by Holy Church is comparatively small, and this passage of St. Paul is not one of them.[2] Instead of putting an official sanction upon the ancient interpretation of Eph. v. 32, the Council of Trent limited itself to the assertion: *Paulus Apostolus innuit.* As if to say, the Church *feels* that the Apostle here enunciates the doctrine of the sacramentality of marriage, but it is a feeling which has not arisen from parsing and grammatical analysis. As we said above, those who are not already aware that Christ raised matrimony to the dignity of a sacrament will scarcely be able to learn it from this "abrupt hint thrown out to the more initiated."

Approaching the subject in an indirect way, let us ask with Erasmus, "Where is the *mystery* in marriage," if it be not a sacra-

---

think too much stress is placed upon the εἰς where we should have expected ἐν. The sacred writers have often interchanged the two propositions, as in the preceding verse *in carnem unam* for *in carne una.* It seems to us that St. Paul meant to speak of marriage *in Christ* in the same sense as he had spoken of marrying *in the Lord.*

[1] A sensible remark! The reformers changed the old-time definition of a sacrament, and then complained that five of the sacraments would not conform to their new-fangled notion!

[2] As an instance of the extreme caution of the Church in making dogmatic decisions regarding scriptural texts, we draw attention to the guarded manner in which the Council of Trent, in order to spare the sensibilities of the Greeks, declared the sense of Matt. xix. 9. See session xxiv., Canon 7.

ment? Stripped of the supernatural glory with which Christ adorned it, does it not sink down to the level of the most ordinary of things? It becomes again what Christ found it, the plaything of animal lust or a matter of barter and sale. Modern atheism has sought to prevent this reign of animalism and materialism by making an apotheosis of Venus *à la mode* of the French novel. Perverted genius has indeed invested the sexual relation with mystery, but it is the mystery of iniquity. The seat of its worship is no longer the altar of God but the opera house and the theatre. It appeals not to the religious feeling of humanity but to those instincts which we possess in common with the horse and the dog. What wonder that the love thus engendered should have many points of resemblance to the love of animals? It was Cicero, we believe, who pointed out that nature had differentiated human love from that of the lower animals by confining it to the inseparable union of single pairs. This remains the natural human ideal; but without the infusion of grace from the Eternal and Unchangeable, it must remain *merely* an ideal.

Love, in the modern gospel, *ends* when marriage *begins*. The love has all but evaporated during the "mysteries" of the courtship. With the marriage ceremony, in modern life as in modern novels, the fascination ceases and the book closes. Raise the curtain after a very short time, and the adoring pair re-appear as plaintiff and respondent in a divorce court. There was an abundance of love and mystery in the old Christian marriages; but the love and the mystery were *subsequent* to the tying of the nuptial knot.

Can the pure code of Christ be made palatable to a corrupt generation? Possibly, in theory; for where is the drunkard who does not admire temperance, or the libertine who reveres not chastity? But so long as false notions prevail of human life and destiny; so long as Epicureanism and naturalism are the guiding principles of society, there will be very little room for the old gospel of mortification and self-restraint. The Church, however, will hold her course with characteristic firmness, and *qui potest capere capiat.*

On a future occasion we shall show how faithfully St. Peter has fulfilled the obligation laid upon him of carrying into effect the matrimonial reforms of His Divine Master.

THE FAILURE OF NATIVE CLERGY.

Pagès: *Annual Letters of the Province of Japan.*
Rohrbacher: *Histoire de l'Eglise.*
Henrion: *Histoire des Missions.*
Juvencius: *Historia Soc. Jes.*
Catologus Occisorum Societatis Jesu Prov. Jap.

THE political transformation that is just now going on in Japan, may be put down as one of the most remarkable things in the world's history. To have a mysterious and mystifying old theocracy, that dates back from the cloudy times of no one knows when, suddenly bound in unbidden before the nations as a ready-made constitutional commonwealth of the nineteenth century, almost takes the world's breath away. And now, the cable tells us that in order to be more in touch with modern monarchs, the Mikado is to make his tour through the world, utterly regardless of the religious gloom that hitherto hung around him and hid him even from his own subjects, as a sort of a god unknown and unknowable.

Naturally, the churchmen of to-day, sharing in the interest that all this excites, are beginning to ask questions about the great church that once flourished so brilliantly and so briefly in those dominions. One ardent writer, commenting on its appalling destruction, ascribes it to the Society of Jesus, and to the short-sighted policy of not ordaining a native clergy, who might have withstood the storm of persecution when foreign priests were no longer able to enter the country. He gives the Society full credit for the glorious martyrdom of so many of its members, but regrets that the policy which prevailed in the mission of Tonquin had not been followed in Japan. Tonquin provided itself with a feeder by establishing the Seminary of Foreign Missions, in France, Japan did not, and, as a consequence, the church of Tonquin flourished while that of Japan died. Finally, forging a weapon wherewith to do battle for his cause, he pays a glowing tribute to the supposed founder of his favorite mission, Alexander de Rhodes, in the following words:

"The illustrious Jesuit, Father Alexander de Rhodes, was the Josue of the Tonquinese mission. His was a broader mind than most of his contemporaries. Driven from Tonquin, he went to Rome, whence, after advising with the Pope, he journeyed to Paris, there to inaugurate the great Seminary of the Foreign Missions."

Now we must premise that it is only by the courtesy of his sincere and warm-hearted admirer that De Rhodes can be called the Josue of the Tonquinese mission, for, in point of fact, he was not the first to enter it, never inaugurated the Seminary of the Foreign Missions, and never led his warriors, or even went back himself, to that promised land. Nevertheless, he was a noble and heroic soul, and deserves all the praise we can give him. Yet if his letters portray him rightly, he would be hurt to find himself exalted at the expense of his brethren. His panegyrist, most likely, did not intend it but admiration misled him.

However there is a service done to truth in giving Father de Rhodes the passing prominence of a periodical. Nothing better than the story of his life and failure can throw light upon the management of the missions in the East, and nothing better be presented as a vindication of the much misunderstood mission of Japan, of which he was a member.

Who was he, then, this Jesuit Josue of Tonquin? He was a noble-hearted Frenchman, who wanted to be a martyr, not in Tonquin but in Japan. It was a couple of hundred years ago—a time rich in martyrs, not in the East alone, but nearer us in Canada, Florida, and our own New York. He was a lad of nineteen when he entered the Society of Jesus at Rome, and was twenty-eight before they made a priest of him. Of course, he went east by the way of Lisbon, for all things, temporal and eternal, passed through Portugal in those days. It was the brilliant period of Portuguese ascendancy and they made the most of it. The thousands of miles of missions, beginning at Goa and Malabar in the west, and stretching around the peninsula of Hindoostan and up through the Straits of Malacca to Cochin, then past Corea and over to Japan, all containing magnificent ecclesiastical establishments, and numbering vast multitudes of Christians, depended for their very existence, not only on the success of Portuguese arms or the happy issue of Portuguese commercial investments, but on the good humor of the monarch by the Tagus, or on the folly and caprice and ignorance of the ministers who happened to advise him. It is true, that the banners of Portugal brought the missionaries with pomp and ceremony to the throne of every little ruler of the East, that her soldiers fought for them when they were driven out or ill treated or slain, and that her gold was poured without stint into their empty coffers; but it is also true that she exacted a most exorbitant tariff from Holy Church in return. For, by agreement with the Pope, no bishop in all that vast extent of the new Christendom could take his see unless Portugal were willing; no new diocese could be created unless Portugal were consulted; and no papal bull was valid, in fact, unless passed on by Portuguese monarchs;

and the humblest missionary could not go to the East unless personally acceptable to the Portuguese government. In a word, Christianity and Portugal were so inextricably entangled and mixed and confused, that it was no longer the religion of Christ but the religion of the Portuguese that figured in the minds of the people as well as in the royal decrees. What was the consequence? A quarrel with a native merchant meant a persecution for the Church; and a war with an Oriental or a European power was certain destruction of what the sublimest virtue, and profoundest knowledge, and best blood of Europe and Asia had been given to establish, but for all which the merchants and politicians cared nothing if it stood in the way of their commercial or political supremacy.

There is the real reason of the persecutions that have desolated those Eastern missions for so many centuries, and are disturbing them yet. It is not the short-sightedness or narrow-mindedness of any religious body of men in not wishing or not striving for what any child could see was essential to their existence, such as the foundation of seminaries, or the establishment of hierarchies, of the formation of a native clergy, but the sordid selfishness of rulers and traders, who used religion as an instrument of worldly advantage, and destroyed it when it no longer served their purpose. The blame of it, or the crime of it, is there, and nowhere else.

The prominence of Alexander de Rhodes was due almost exclusively to his struggle to emancipate the missions from that bondage by getting bishops not identified with Portugal or her possessions. His disastrous failure to do so, backed as he was by the entire Society of Jesus (for it was their fight more than his), shows how powerful was the foe with whom they had to contend, and at the same time how absolutely free from fault they were in this respect, and how unfair it is to charge them with the ruin of the Church in Japan.

That conviction is driven home at every successive defeat in this contest, and the argument is all the more cogent as De Rhodes, in the minds of the censors of the Japanese mission, is so much wiser and better and more successful than his fellows. Let us look at him well. In the first place, he was a Jesuit, belonging to the very section of the society which is the object of such misrepresentation—Japan. He could not reach Japan, so he went to Tonquin; and his missionary career there ended, as he stood by the side of his catechist and saw the spear go through his body and the cimeter strike off his head. He, himself, was condemned, but was back again in Macao in 1645. In 1645 he went to Rome as Procurator of the province of Japan, that is to say, he was the mouth-piece to the Father-General of the wishes of the Fathers in those missions. This fact is important, as showing that there was

no dissociation in these matters between the Jesuits of Japan and Tonquin. There could not be; the men were personally identical—Tonquin was only an out-mission of the older province of Japan.

He went overland through Persia, and it took him four years to make the journey; but it was better than to take the risk of being flung into a Portuguese prison, which might happen if he took the usual route, and the object of his mission was suspected. Of course, he went first to the General of the Society, without whose direction and assistance and sympathy he could do nothing whatever. He appeared before the Pope as a private individual, for the simple reason that if his mission were regarded as coming from the Society, there would be danger of every Jesuit mission in the Portuguese dominions being obliterated by the stroke of a pen, as happened a hundred years later for a lesser offence. "I went often to the Pope," says De Rhodes, "and to the cardinals, and finally, after three years, got the Propaganda to ask for a patriarch, three archbishops, and and twelve bishops." Three years to get the request even formulated! Nothing came of it; simply because Portuguese influence prevailed, and so De Rhodes went off to Paris. He found material there, he thought, for bishops, in an association of ecclesiastics directed by a Jesuit, and proposed them to Rome, in spite of the fact that several of them had asked to be admitted to the Society. They were refused admission, simply because of the episcopal potentialities in them. In the midst of it all, the Pope died, and the whole air-built structure went to pieces; and after six years' fruitless efforts in Rome, De Rhodes went back, not to Tonquin, for his mission had made him obnoxious to Portugal, and Tonquin was shut upon him forever; and so he went away disappointed and disheartened, yet resigned, and died in Persia, where there were probably no Portuguese.

Now comes a sort of fairy god-mother in this distressful story. The Duchess d'Aiguillon (portentous name for sluggish souls) took up the cause, and urged it on the French nuncio at Rome, who urged it on the Pope, who took it up; but—strange fatality for poor Tonquin—this time, Alberici, the secretary of the Propaganda no less, appears as the marplot and does all he can to prevent the happy consummation of the work. But at last the opposition was overcome, and a Frenchman, Pallu by name, was appointed Vicar-Apostolic of Tonquin. What a descent from the magnificent scheme of poor dead De Rhodes, with his patriarch and archbishops and bishops! This was in 1658, nine years after De Rhodes had come to Rome. Of course, Pallu went immediately to his see! Not at all. The Portuguese, and Dutch, and English, all refused to carry him to India, although Louis XIV. asked it as a favor. Then, a rival line of vessels was suggested, but not to wait till it was es-

tablished, Pallu's associate, the Bishop of Cochin-China, started out alone. His Majesty's minions of Portugal went after the fugitive in hot haste, with orders to bring him back to Portugal; the chase lasted two years; but at last the bishop reached, not his diocese of Cochin-China, but Siam. The bishop we are interested in, he of Tonquin, could only leave in 1662, thirteen years after De Rhodes had come a begging for a bishop, or seventeen, if we count from the time he started from Macao. That bishop, also, got no further than Siam, and he was back in Europe again in 1665 begging for protection against the Portuguese, who were carrying off his priests and putting them in the jails of Goa and Macao, pretty much as the slave-hunters that Stanley speaks of do to-day in Darkest Africa.

In 1674, the poor bishop, then shipwrecked in Manilla, was put in prison, not by Portugal this time but by Spain, which happened to be at war with France, and was actually carried to Spain. It took the joint efforts of Innocent XI. and Louis XIV. to liberate him; and finally, in 1684, he was driven by a tempest on the Chinese island of Formosa, and died in Novang, never having once set his foot in his diocese of Tonquin.

Now let us do a little figuring. Tonquin was first entered by Father Baldinotti, S.J., in 1626, a year before De Rhodes. For the first fifty years, *i.e.*, up to 1676, only one Vicar-Apostolic or Bishop of Tonquin was named, and he never reached the country. A neighboring bishop made a hasty visit once in disguise, but that was all.

On the other hand, the first Jesuit landed in Japan in 1548. He was St. Francis Xavier. During the first fifty years, *i.e.*, as far as 1599, five bishops were appointed (their names are given in the February number of the *Catholic World*), and the last one, Sequiera, remained there fourteen consecutive years. Five to one is a strong balance in favor of Japan and against Tonquin, and yet there is nothing but praise for Tonquin, and nothing but blame for Japan. It is one of those mysteries of sympathy that are hard to explain except on the ground of imperfect information.

It is true that Rohrbacher is very severe in his censure of the management of the Japanese missions; but history is sometimes, as a picturesque American calls it, only dull fiction. As Rohrbacher is known to have deliberately refused even to read certain documents, vouched for as correct, which related to the Eastern missions, and to have left them on his library shelf where they were found six months after covered with dust and unopened, we need not regard him with too much reverence.

Doubtless also the Popes wrote very severe letters commanding the ordination of native clergy, but evidently those Apostolic lightnings were not intended to strike the men who were giving

their lives for the same cause :—and the missionaries well understood it,—but the censure was aimed at the secular powers who were impeding the progress of the work.

If we must have Pontifical documents on the subject, let us not go back a couple of centuries to some phrase that with a little good will may bear any interpretation, but let us take the bulls and briefs of our own time, now that the mists of history are cleared up, and the powers of the world no longer inspire such dread. Let us hear Pius IX. speaking in 1862. In the first paragraph of the Bull of Canonization of the Japanese Martyrs, he says : " Maxima in eadem provincia pericula ac difficultates perpassi, Patres Societatis Jesu grandia incœpta grandibus incrementis nobilitarunt ;" " The Father of the Society of Jesus having gone through the greatest dangers and difficulties in that country enhanced a glorious beginning by a glorious growth." And then, after recounting something of what had been done, concludes with : " Ecclesias pluribus in regnis fundarunt, excitaverunt collegia, scholas instituerunt, et seminaria ;" " They founded churches in many kingdoms, built colleges, and established schools and seminaries."

Will that suffice as an official proof that the Society did try to establish seminaries and to ordain native priests ? Or must the unfriendly Rohrbacher again be adduced as saying : " No, the seminaries of the Jesuits were only colleges." What marvellous men those missionaries must have been to be able to hoodwink all time, and play hide and go-seek with truth forever ! But let it pass. And let Pius IX. tell us that these Jesuits " built schools and colleges." The repetition interferes somewhat with the dignity of the document, but that need not be considered. Suppose they did " found colleges and colleges." Is it then impossible to teach theology in a college ? Are we willing to make that assertion in these days, when we have Seton Hall College, and Mt. St. Mary's College, and the College of Maynooth, and All-Hallows College ? Even Yale is only a college, and Harvard is no more. Our times have also inaugurated what we call Apostolic Schools, whose sole purpose is to train up missioners, and yet they are only schools after all. A name is a trifle, when facts are what we seek.

Now this is certain. that the greater part if not all that we or any one can know about what happened there comes from and through the saints and martyrs who evangelized those regions, and we can trust them more than Rohrbacher when they tell us of their efforts to secure Bishops and to ordain a native clergy. It is true that there may have been individuals among the Fathers who thought the Japanese not yet quite ready for ordination. Perhaps they were right. But that is quite a different thing from the accepted policy of the Society. The men who in China were

radical enough to propose to do away with Latin and take Chinese as the language of the ritual so as to ordain priests quicker, were not likely to inaugurate a different method of treatment in the adjoining region of Japan where the people were so much superior in intellectual ability. Even De Rhodes himself, who is regarded as the preacher of the new Evangel, spent ten years of his life teaching theology to the Japanese fugitives at Macao. No doubt as Rohrbacher, says, "St. Paul did not wait so long in Crete or Rome to ordain and consecrate," but it must be remembered that St. Paul had the most highly cultivated people of the world to deal with, and not men who were comparatively barbarians, and it is doubtful if even he could have ordained them, if he had been martyred or shipwrecked before he got there. Nor would it be imputed to him as a "faute énorme" as Rohrbacher says it was, if he failed to do so. St. James does not seem to have left any converts in Spain worth speaking of, and yet it is not a faute énorme for him. God has his own way and purposes in success and failure.

Finally, while we admire the great Father De Rhodes and give him all the praise which his heroic and beautiful life demands, let us not do him and others injustice by giving him the credit of improving on the Society's methods by inaugurating the Seminary of the Foreign Missions. What would old Cardinal Allen say to that, whose first subscription for his missionary English College of Rheims, for the conversion of England, came from the Society of Jesus, and who received with open arms such men as Campion, and Parsons and Southwell and the host of others who went side by side with the secular clergy to win back to the faith the country where even the native clergy were not spared? Why is it that the students of the German College stand at the name of St. Ignatius, and with uncovered heads hear his virtues told in the martyrology before his feast? Because it was he at the beginning of the Society who had laid the corner-stone of that house that was to gather together the choicest of the German youth and send them back to save their country from heresy. The idea is not a new one or newly wrought out by De Rhodes. It is as old as the Church. Its missionaries in Japan, in their time, did all that was possible to lay as deep as they could, and as rapidly as they could, the foundations of a well-trained and well-disciplined native clergy in Japan and to supply it with workers from without. If they did not succeed as well as they wished and as much as they deserved, they are not to blame, and if De Rhodes is exalted for his rare wisdom, although such an utter failure, we must not withhold our need of praise from the men who had some success. De Rhodes was not opposed to them in his methods. He was a

Jesuit brought up in the same religious family, with the same training, the same instincts and the same traditions. They all did what great and heroic men could do, and if they went under before the the embattled wickedness of Christendom and heathendom combined, it was because the world was too much for them as it had often been before and will be again.

It is the Church's history in every time; the land of St. Cyprian and St. Augustine which was covered from one end to the other with sanctuaries, is now a Moslem wilderness. Asia Minor, the birth-place of St. Paul and once the Eden of the church is pretty much in the same condition; and if you seek a modern instance, England, once absolutely Catholic and the home of numberless saints, was to all appearances hopelessly lost until our own days; and the reason is not to be sought in the absence of a native clergy, but because the sword and fire of the persecutor had passed over them and left them desolate. Even the Son of God permitted Himself to succumb to the power of the Prince of Darkness.

Scientific Chronicle.

RADIANT MATTER.

In the April number of the Quarterly we gave a brief synopsis of the modern theory concerning the three states of matter, the solid, the liquid and the gaseous, with a promise to add something about a possible fourth state, viz., the radiant state of matter. We will endeavor, in the following pages, to make our promise good for its face value.

It is now just three-quarters of a century since Michael Faraday conceived the idea of this fourth state. To introduce the new candidate, we cannot do better than quote Faraday's own words, written at that time:

"If we conceive," says he, "a change as far beyond vaporization as that is above fluidity, and then take into account also the proportional increased extent of alteration as the changes rise, we shall perhaps, if we can form any conception at all, not fall far short of radiant matter; and as in the last conversion many qualities were lost, so here also many more would disappear."

Three years later we find him at it again, and seeking to prove by analogy the possibility and probability of the existence of this radiant state, thus: "I may now notice a curious progression in physical properties accompanying changes of form, and which is perhaps sufficient to induce, in the inventive and sanguine philosopher, a considerable degree of belief in the association of the radiant form with the others in the set of changes I have mentioned.

"As we ascend from the solid to the fluid and gaseous states, physical properties diminish in number and variety, each state losing some of those which belonged to the preceding state."

We will be better able to grasp the full meaning of Faraday's words by entering into some details. Let us take a few substances which we may cause to assume, at will, either the solid, the liquid or the gaseous form. It is in our power to do this with many of the chemical elements, and with a vast number of chemical compounds. Thus, lead, copper, zinc, magnesium, sodium, potassium, sulphur, phosphorus, etc., solid at our ordinary temperatures, may be readily made to pass into the liquid, and thence into the gaseous state. Two others, bromine and mercury, may be made to descend to the solid or mount to the gaseous state. All the known gases have been liquefied, and probably solidified, even oxygen, hydrogen, and nitrogen. These are examples of elementary substances only, but it is useless to mention compound ones; their name is legion.

Now, bodies in the solid state differ from each other in their physical properties in many ways; liquids differ from each other less than solids, and gases differ from each other still less than liquids. Thus:

Solids differ from each other in :

(1.) Color. (2.) Hardness. (3.) Brittleness. (4.) Transparency. (5.) The form of their crystals—all or nearly all the solid elements are crystalline, and so are untold numbers of the compounds. (6.) Elasticity of torsion, of traction, of flexure, of compression. (7.) Strength. (8.) Specific gravity, *i.e.*, relative weight. (9.) Compressibility. (10.) Malleability, ductility, etc. (11.) Their behavior under the action of electricity and magnetism.

The same bodies when made liquid differ from each other in :

(1.) Color, to a slight degree and in a few cases only.

(8.) Specific gravity.

(9.) Compressibility, slightly.

(11.) Under electricity and magnetism, very slightly.

But they have ceased to differ from each other in :

(2.) Hardness, which has entirely disappeared.

(3.) Brittleness, which no longer exists.

(4.) Transparency, all have become about equally transparent.

(5.) Form of crystals, all crystalline forms lost.

(6.) Elasticity of torsion, traction, flexure, which no longer exists; and of compression, which is equally perfect in all liquids.

(7.) Strength, all lost; for, in the mechanical senses, liquids cannot be said to have strength.

(10.) Malleability, etc., no longer exist.

When the same bodies are converted into gases they differ from each other in :

(1.) Color, to a very slight extent.

(8.) Specific gravity.

(11.) Behavior under electricity and magnetism.

But all differences as to the other properties enumerated have entirely disappeared. Solids, then, differ from each other in many ways. In passing to the liquid condition many points of difference are lost; in passing from the liquid to the gaseous state, yet more are lost. Now if a fourth condition, still more exalted, does exist, in arriving at it, bodies should lose more yet of their former physical differences.

Such was the grand intuition of Faraday. To him it was given to ascend the mountain and gaze afar over the lands of science yet to be won; to point onward and say: "Here you will find the explanation of this phenomenon, there of that one; here you will find the solution of the difficulties of electrical induction, there you will find radiant matter." He saw it as in a vision, but he might not lay his hands upon nor pass over to it. He had no experiments to prove its properties, but he saw that if it did exist, its properties must be thus and so. He died on the mountain and left to others to lead on towards the goal he had in view.

Has the intuition of Faraday been realized? We believe it has, though at the same time we know there are many doubters and not a few downright unbelievers.

After it dropped from Faraday's hands the cause of radiant matter

made little progress in the scientific world until a few years ago, when Dr. William Crookes, the eminent scientist of London, took the subject in hand experimentally. He believes he has succeeded in producing it and getting it under control, and whatever knowledge we have concerning it is due to him.

After all, what *is* radiant matter?

It is something very innocent, very simple; so simple indeed that many have turned away dissatisfied. They expected something very startling, something very complex, something fearfully and wonderfully made, and when they saw the modest little affair that Crookes had to offer, albeit it can produce effects of wondrous beauty, they refused to believe.

Well, what is radiant matter?

Independently of any and every theory about the solid, the liquid and the gaseous states, radiant matter is nothing more than ordinary matter in an extremely rarefied condition. For example, if we take a closed vessel filled at ordinary atmospheric pressure with any kind of matter in the gaseous condition, and then by means of an air-pump exhaust it until we have left about the one-thousandth part of what it first contained, the residue will still have the properties of the original gas. But if we continue the exhaustion until we have but the one-millionth part left, that part is found to have properties so different from those of the gas which we started with, that we feel justified in calling it by a different name.

If, happily, we have accepted the modern theory, of which we spoke in the April number, then we will say that matter is in the radiant state when the molecules are so few in a given space that they can travel measurable distances without appreciably interfering with one another; or, better perhaps, when the number of collisions in a given space is very small compared with the number of misses. Radiant matter is, therefore, not a newly discovered chemical substance, but any ordinary substance in a fourth or ultra-gaseous condition. In gaseous matter the molecules are within the range of each other's influence, at least to some extent; in radiant matter the molecules seem to be absolutely independent of one another.

What now is the evidence that matter may, and, under proper conditions, does exist in this fourth state? Simply the evidence of experiment. We wish we could bring all our readers together, and, equipped with a complete set of first-class instruments, show them the properties of matter in its fourth state, and let them see for themselves and be convinced that what we intend to describe later on is strictly true. It is proverbially hard to understand experiments that we do not see—it is phenomenally hard to understand them without the aid of even a woodcut, but we have faith enough in the intelligence of our readers to give them a chance to try.

To avoid useless repetitions, we will first describe the general make-up of the pieces of apparatus employed, and afterwards speak of the uses of the several pieces in detail.

Some of the pieces are cylindrical tubes of glass, varying in length from a few inches to two or three feet, and from an inch to an inch and a half in diameter. Others are in the form of bulbs, more or less spherical, and from three to six inches in diameter. It will be readily understood, however, that the mere size of these vessels is of minor importance. Into the walls of these vessels, in positions determined by the intended use, are welded platinum wires which project to a greater or less distance inside, and terminate on the outside in a little ring or loop. The object of this loop is to enable us to make connection with the poles of an electrical machine (statical), or of an induction coil. The coil of a medical outfit which gives shocks is an induction coil, but the one we make use of in these experiments is much more powerful. When, in the experiments to be described below, we speak of electricity, we always mean the electricity obtained through an induction coil. It sets the radiant matter in violent motion, and so gives us the means of studying some at least of its properties.

We have said that wires of platinum are welded into the walls of the vessels; we do not use the blacksmith's methods for this: the wire is passed through an opening loosely, the glass is softened around the wire by heat, and in that condition contracts around the wire and forms a perfectly tight joint. Platinum is the only metal known which expands and contracts under changes of temperature to about the same degree as glass, and since the glass frequently becomes quite hot during experimentation, it would be cracked by the unequal expansion, if any other metal were used. Platinum, however, has its disadvantages, too. Under the influence of the electricity it evaporates, and the molecules, thus set free, cover the inside of the vessel, especially in the vicinity of the wire, with a black coating of the metal, which, of course, sooner or later, becomes detrimental.

In some of his later pieces of apparatus, Dr. Crookes has left out the platinum wires altogether, and has merely deposited on portions of the *outside* of the vessels, a thin coating of pure silver; and with this the electrodes (poles) are placed in contact.

When these vessels pass from the hands of the glass-blower, a narrow cylindrical neck is left projecting outwards from some convenient part, by means of which connection may be made with a good air-pump.

The vessels are next filled with any gas or mixture of gases whatever, and then exhausted to any desired degree. Dr. Crookes says that he can easily exhaust, not merely to a hundredth or a millionth, but to a hundred-millionth of an atmosphere; and this is far beyond what is required. The proper degree of exhaustion having been reached, the little neck mentioned above is carefully softened in the flame of a blowpipe, until, under the external pressure of the atmosphere, its sides collapse and adhere together, and thus hermetically close the vessel. The pieces of apparatus so constructed are fairly permanent; each has its own little story to tell, and, under proper persuasion, is willing to tell it over and over again, many times. In his own experimentation, Dr. Crookes does not generally close the vessels, as described, but uses the

air-pump each time, and so can watch continuously the varying effects, from the beginning of the exhaustion to the last limit attainable.

It is time now to make some experiments, and see what they will teach us. We have before us a tube manufactured as above. It is about ten inches long and one and a half inches in diameter. The ends are drawn out slightly tapering, and through them the platinum wires extend to a distance of a quarter of an inch. Across the interior of the tube, at its middle part, is a circular dish of aluminum, just slightly smaller in diameter than the bore of the tube. It is held fast in place by a platinum wire which passes through the side of the tube. In this and in other cases, where a large surface of metal is required inside of a vessel, aluminum is used, because it does not evaporate after the manner of platinum.

To make the experiment for which this tube is intended, the aluminum disc is put in connection with the negative pole of the coil, the two end-wires with the positive pole, and the electricity turned on. If the tube has been exhausted to the proper degree, it will now appear to be filled with a brilliant white fog, except for a narrow space on either side of the disc in which we have perfect darkness. The fog is not equally bright throughout; it is at its brightest just on the confines of the "*dark space.*" The width of this dark space depends on the degree of exhaustion. The explanation offered for this phenomenon is, that the molecules of matter are shot off from the negative pole with immense velocity, and travel a certain average distance before being seriously impeded by the molecules which are leisurely returning from the positive pole. This distance has been called the *mean free path* of the molecules, for that particular degree of exhaustion and for that given electrical impulse. A mean free path is there, even when there is no electricity at work, but it will be shorter. It exists also in gaseous as well as in radiant matter, but in the latter case it is enormously greater than in the former. Thus it has been calculated that in air, at ordinary pressure, the mean free path of the molecules is the 1–250,000 of an inch, while, if it were rarefied to the 1–100,000,000 of an atmosphere, the mean free path would be about 30 feet. This latter condition corresponds to the state of the air at 90 miles from the surface of the earth. At 200 miles from the surface of the earth, the mean free path of the molecules would be 10,000,000 miles! Let us get back to our tube from which we have strayed. We know that motion arrested may produce heat and light. We have seen iron made red hot by hammering; we have seen a flash of light when the bullet struck the target. If, then, two opposing armies were each sending a continuous shower of balls against the other, and if these opposing balls were to impinge, in their flight, against each other with sufficient velocity, there would be in front of each army a "dark space" of a certain width, while the rest of the space between would be more or less luminous from the flashing of the colliding balls. Just so it is in the tube, from the collisions of the molecules. This explanation has the merit of explaining, and no other one has been offered. The proof that radiant matter does travel, and at enormous velocities,

will be forthcoming in subsequent experiments. In the meantime, this point is made, that radiant matter is capable of producing a dark space, wide enough to be seen, while gaseous matter is not.

An objection occurs, and perhaps it may be as well to answer it just here. If, as has been said, the molecules of radiant matter are in motion anyhow, why do we not have luminosity and the dark space without bringing in the aid of electricity? The answer is, that the molecules are indeed in motion, but in a helter-skelter, disorderly way, just as if our two armies were firing at random in all conceivable directions, and hence very little effect is produced, too little to give us light; but electricity marshals them in battle array, so that every blow tells, and, besides, adds to their velocity; the effect is thus heightened so as to become visible.

We now take another piece of apparatus. It consists of three distinct tubes, which are each about four inches long and one inch in diameter. Into the ends of these, straight platinum wires penetrate to the depth of about an inch. One of them is made of canary glass, another of English glass, the third of soft German glass. The exhaustion has been carried so far, that the mean free path (dark space) is at least equal to the distance of the wires from the sides of the tubes. We take the first tube and start the electricity through it. There is no white light now, but that end of the tube which is connected to the negative pole, shines with a dark-green light. This light does not *fill* the tube; it is merely on the interior surface of the glass. If we reverse the poles, which may be done very readily by means of a commutator attached to the coil, the light shifts to the other end. Taking the second tube, the result will be similar, except that the light will be blue, and, in the third tube, a very bright apple-green. This last is by far the most beautiful of the three, and so, for æsthetic reasons, most of the pieces of apparatus have been made of this soft German glass.

Here we have a new phenomenon, showing that when radiant matter, discharged from the negative pole, strikes against certain kinds of glass, it has the property of exciting in them a luminosity, differing in color, according to the nature of the glass. On account of its resemblance to the glow of phosphorus, slowly oxidizing in the dark, it has been called "phosphorescence." Nor is this property of responding luminously to the bombardment of the molecules confined to glass. Many other substances possess it in an even higher degree, and the colors produced are of every possible variety. The substances to be experimented on are enclosed in suitable vessels, and the mean free path made equal to the full dimensions of those vessels, and the radiant matter directed against them from the face of a flat, aluminum, negative pole. The diamond, under these conditions, gives out a bright green light, equal sometimes in intensity to the light of a candle. Rubies are not all red, but be their color what it may, be they natural or artificial, they all glow, under the blows of radiant matter, with a rich, deep red, that no words can describe. Scores of other substances are endowed with the same power, vying with each other in the beauty and brightness and fairy

delicacy of the tints they produce. Matter in the gaseous state makes no attempt to imitate these effects.

Our next tube has been made for the express purpose of showing that the phosphorescence of the glass depends on the degree of exhaustion. It is about three feet long by two inches in diameter. At one end is a small supplementary tube, in communication with the main tube by a narrow neck, and containing solid caustic potash. This potash absorbs moisture greedily, and it is only by intense heat that it can ever be entirely expelled. A platinum wire, as a positive pole, enters the main tube, near its junction with the small one, and another at its opposite end. This second wire carries an aluminum disc, slightly convex, the convex surface being turned towards the potash tube. This disc is made the negative pole. If now our radiant matter is projected perpendicularly from each part of the surface of the disc, and the mean free path be long enough, it will strike against the tube throughout its entire length. The tube has been exhausted to something like the 1–100,000,000 of an atmosphere. We turn on the electricity, but we find that we have overreached, for it absolutely refuses to pass. If we next warm the potash slightly, a little alcohol lamp will do it, a trace of vapor of water will be liberated, and will enter the main tube as radiant matter. The interior surface of the tube is now resplendent with green light. We continue the heating so as to liberate a little more vapor of water; the green light retreats reluctantly, step by step, towards the negative end of the tube, and is replaced by a purple light, which at first fills the whole bore of the tube, but settles down later to a narrow line along the axis. The condition now is precisely that of a tube containing a rarefied gas. We take away the lamp, and as the potash cools, it slowly reabsorbs the vapor of water, and everything returns to its pristine state. From this experiment it is clear that the radiant condition depends simply on the degree of exhaustion; and this fact justifies the definition already given.

Matter, rarefied, it is true, but still in the gaseous state, will, under the influence of electricity, be illuminated throughout the whole length of the containing tubes, whatever may be the number of twists and turns given to them. Tubes thus arranged are called Geissler tubes, from the name of the inventor. The next experiment shows that such is not the fact in the case of radiant matter. A tube in the form of a V, that is, having but a single bend, is fitted at its two upper ends with wires terminating in discs; these discs face the ends of the tube. The mean free path is made greater than the length of the tube. On starting the coil, we see the branch of the tube which carries the negative pole, shining with a phosphorescent green light, but that light absolutely refuses to follow the bend and pass into the positive branch. If we reverse the poles, the light changes from one branch to the other, but cannot be coaxed or driven beyond the bend in either case. Here again is a striking difference between radiant and gaseous matter.

In another experiment, instead of tubes, we have a pair of bulbs, made as nearly alike as possible. They are nearly spherical in shape, and

about six inches in diameter. In each a short wire enters at the top, another at the bottom, another at the middle of the side. In the opposite side, but lower down, is a fourth wire, carrying a small, concave disc, the face of which is directed to a point on the glass, midway between the top and the side wires. One of the bulbs has been exhausted to about 1–10, the other to 1–1,000,000 of atmospheric pressure. The first contains matter, therefore, in the gaseous ; the second, matter in the radiant state. Connecting the disc with the negative, and each of the three wires, in succession, with the positive pole, we get, in the first bulb, a purple light, extending in an easy curve from one pole to the other. Reversing the poles makes no apparent difference; the bulb behaves precisely as a Geissler. In the second bulb the effect is very different. A spot of green light appears on the glass at the point towards which the face of the negative pole is directed, and remains there, no matter which of the three wires be made positive. The sole anxiety of the radiant matter seems to be to get away from the negative pole as directly as possible, and therefore at right-angles to its surface, and in perfectly straight lines. We know of but one way, to be mentioned further on, of coaxing it aside from the path of rectitude; and even then, as we shall see, it refuses to copy vilely the devious example set it by gross gaseous matter. That it is projected from the negative pole, in lines normal to the surface of that pole, is proved in every experiment by noting, in each case, the spot where the vessels or objects placed within them show phosphorescence, and also by noting where the matter itself comes to a focus, when the negative pole is concave. That spot and that focus are always just where they ought to be, according to the statement made above, and no other supposition will explain the phenomena; nor are any similar phenomena ever produced in the Geissler tube.

Moreover, if radiant matter striking against glass causes it to glow with phosphorescent light, and by this time we know it does, and if it travels in straight lines, as we also know, then an obstacle set up between the negative pole and the opposite end of the vessel must cast a shadow. The bulb used to show this resembles a very elongated pear, being about eight inches long, and about three inches in diameter at its widest part. The negative pole is a flat disc, fixed in the smaller end of the bulb and facing directly the larger end. A small screen of sheet aluminum, cut to some design, is placed athwart the middle of the bulb; this screen is put in connection with the positive pole. When the coil is in action a perfectly distinct, clear-cut, shadow of the screen is projected, at the right place, on the larger end of the bulb. You may endeavor to make gaseous matter, under like conditions, cast a shadow, but, just as when you send a boy on a man's errand, the result will be a failure.

Again, if radiant matter, striking against solid matter, can cause it to give forth light, then it must be endowed with mechanical energy. Let us test this. Inside of one of our radiant-matter tubes and running its entire length, two glass rails are placed, parallel to, and on a level with

the axis of the tube. A light paddle-wheel, the axle of which is a bit of round glass-rod, the paddles bits of mica, is arranged so as to run along the rails. At the extremities of the tube, but above its axis, two flat poles are fixed so as to face each other, and be on a line with the uppermost paddles. Inclining the tube slightly, the little wheel rolls along on its axle to the lower end; it remains there when the tube is replaced in a horizontal position. The pole at this end is made negative, the electric current is started, and lo, the wheel begins to rotate and roll along the rails to the other end of the tube. Then we reverse the current, and it rolls back again. This method of propulsion has not been patented, so that if any of our railroads would like to use it, there will be no danger of lawsuits. There is but one explanation possible, which is, that the molecules of radiant matter in the tube do actually move in straight lines, and strike good, honest blows. They can do this because they have been thinned out enough to have elbow-room, and act independently of each other, while in a gas the molecules are too crowded for this kind of work. And hence, in a Geissler tube, this effect cannot be produced.

Another objection starts up here. If this radiant matter be shot off continuously from the negative pole what becomes of it, and what keeps up the supply? Naturally we would expect it to return again, and so it does. It returns more slowly than it goes, otherwise none of the phenomena mentioned above could take place. We will now prove that it does return. A vessel, eight inches long and four in diameter, is divided transversely into two equal parts by a glass partition. There are two small holes in this partition, one above, the other below the centre. A concave negative pole is focussed on the upper hole, and just behind the hole is a paddle-wheel which can revolve on its pivoted axle; near the *front* of the lower hole is another paddle-wheel similarly suspended. Now when the upper wheel is made to revolve by the outgoing radiant matter, the lower wheel revolves in the opposite direction. This can be explained only by the *return* of the molecules through the lower hole.

We have already remarked that there is but one cause, as far as we know at present, capable of deflecting a stream of radiant matter from its straight course. That cause is magnetism. Across one end of a tube, near its flat negative pole, is a metal screen. Fastened to the central line of this screen, and at right angles to it, is a rectangular screen of mica running the whole length of the tube, along its axis. The mica screen is covered with some substance which will phosphoresce when subjected to the blows of radiant matter. A slit is made in the metal screen in such a way that the radiant matter passing through will trace a line of light along the mica screen. That line of light is perfectly straight. If now a powerful magnet be presented to the tube, in a particular position, the line of light will be deflected downwards in a curve to the bottom of the tube; if the magnet be turned over, the line will be curved upwards to the top of the tube. In neither case, after having passed the magnet, will it return to the axis. If, on the contrary, we take a Geissler tube, in which a luminous line occupies the

axis, that line will indeed be deflected by the magnet to a certain extent; but having got past the magnet it immediately resumes its original position along the axis.

We next take a number of tubes, each containing a different substance, as oxygen, hydrogen, etc., but all in the radiant state; we find that they all behave exactly alike in any test to which we may subject them. It is true it will require a higher degree of exhaustion to bring some to the radiant state than it does to bring others there. This need not surprise us any more than does the fact that some substances are brought to the gaseous state with more difficulty than others. This loss of all differences of properties, as characteristic of the radiant state, is precisely what Faraday prophesied, and the prophecy has the rare merit of having been fulfilled to the letter.

We have gone so far beyond our intended limits that we ought to call a halt; yet there is one experiment which we cannot bring ourselves to omit. In the centre of a spherical bulb, four or five inches in diameter, is fixed horizontally a flat strip of some difficultly fusible metal, iridio-platinum for example. Below this is a large, deeply concave pole, whose focus is just on the strip of metal. This concave pole being made negative and the metal strip positive, such is the energy of the molecules discharged against the strip that in a few seconds it becomes first red- and then white-hot.

We had intended to answer some objections, but have concluded it would be just as well to wait till they have been proposed.

We have seen, by experiment, that we have been dealing with something which differs from a gas, at least as much as a gas differs from a liquid, or a liquid from a solid; and we see no reason, therefore, why it should not receive a name. Faraday proposed the name Radiant, and knowing as we now do that it is *projected in straight lines* from a pole of the coil, the name seems very appropriate. In conclusion, permit us to believe that it exists, and that it will yet come out triumphant and RADIANT.

A FALL OF A THOUSAND FEET.

"O what a fall was there, my countrymen!"
—MARC ANTONY.

IT will be remembered that in the last number of this REVIEW we gave a few notes concerning some tall towers; and that reminds us of the wise saying often used in certain of our school-boy games: "What goes up must come down." Truly, people who ascend towers do not, we believe, usually intend to take up a fixed abode, acquire a permanent domicile as it were, at the top. And so comes in the problem of descent, not indeed in the Darwinian sense, but in a plain, matter-of-fact, mechanical way. Most persons, we fancy, would naturally be in-

clined to return by the elevator; some might possibly be willing to try the stairway; a few, more venturesome ones, might even be tempted to risk a descent by a balloon. It has remained for a French engineer, Mr. Charles Carron, of Grenoble, to invent another more expeditious, and withal much more exciting method. Until we have donned our wings and learned to fly, it would seem that, besides the ways just mentioned, the only other way left would be to jump. Reader, if you have guessed *that*, you have guessed very nearly right, for Mr. Carron proposes to have us try a clear fall of, say, one thousand feet! On second thought, perhaps you have guessed entirely right. For, when we say that a person jumps *down*, be it from a chair, or a table, or even a tower, we talk in parables, and the truth is not in us. No one ever jumps *down*, for the very sufficient reason that it is an impossibility. That's not the way the thing works at all. What does take place is, that a person jumps upward and outward so as to clear the support; the rest is pure fall.

Mother Earth has a most loving attraction for all her children, animate and inanimate, and does not like to have them stray away from her. She has, moreover, a very emphatic way of coaxing them back when they have strayed. With much toil we may climb away from her, a few feet or a few yards, or even to the top of an Eiffel tower, or a Mount Blanc, if you will, but she still reaches out with a mysterious influence that ever keeps holding us back, and gently warns us, saying: "My child, don't go too far, lest your return be disagreeably sudden; but, if you do want to get back quickly, just let go your hold, or step off your support, and I'll do the rest." And she does it every time. You may, indeed, jump upward a short distance of your own will; you must come down again, will or no will.

Again, you may project a body away from the earth, and the distance it will go depends on the velocity with which it starts, according to a somewhat complex law of mechanics. Be that distance now, however great (short of infinity) you choose to make it, that body, unless captured by some star out on police duty, must, sooner or later, come home again. The departure may be likened to a *jump;* the return is simply a *fall.*

We do not know whether any of our readers have yet begun to consider about trying that fall of a thousand feet. We do not mean, of course, with a suicidal intent; as Christians, that's not our way, and it would be very bad form anyhow. Neither is that Mr. Carron's idea. He, indeed, proposes to give us a fall of a thousand feet,—that's easy enough; but he promises to land us safe and sound at the bottom,—that's where the difficulty comes in.

"*Facilis descensus Averno; sed revocare gradum, hoc opus, hic labor est.*"

Progress is easy on a down-hill track,
Bvt slow and laborious is the getting back.

Had Virgil known that we intended to quote his remarks in this matter, he might have made the latter part of them a little more to the

point. Not the getting back, but the coming safely to a full stop is the question. We propose now to examine, with our readers, the method by which Mr. Carron undertakes to accomplish such a result. He would build a sort of cage, or car, capable of seating fifteen persons, draw it up to the top of a thousand-foot tower, and let it drop into a well of water two hundred feet deep, full nearly to the brim. The well is to be of such a form and diameter that the country round about need not be inundated by splash or overflow. That part is easily contrived and settled. What interests us more just now, is to get an idea of the car in which we are expected to take passage. It is made up of a cylinder and an inverted cone attached together, base to base, so as to form one body; the axis is vertical. The total height is fifty feet, of which the cylindrical portion is sixteen, and the conical portion thirty-four feet. The diameter of the cylindrical part is ten feet. At the junction of the cylinder with the cone is a strong floor, well stayed by a rod running from the centre of the floor down to the apex of the cone, and by three internal cones, concentric with the outer one, and connected rigidly with both the rod and the floor. Above this floor is a second one, of a diameter slightly smaller than the inside of the cylinder. It is supported by a number of strong spiral springs of the form frequently used in mattresses. They allow the upper floor a vertical play of nearly two feet. To the centre of this floor is firmly fastened a circular table, around which, with their backs towards the centre, are secured fifteen armchairs. These chairs are heavily padded, and are intended to conform, as nearly as possible, to the contour of the seated passengers. A door, opening on a level with the movable floor, and which, when closed, is continuous with the rest of the cylinder, will serve as a means of ingress and egress. An electric lamp, fed by a suitable battery, and suspended from the centre of the vaulted ceiling, completes the furniture.

The shell of the car and the cones are of sheet steel, stiffened with ribs of T-iron, and of course made perfectly water-tight. According to accounts furnished by scientific journals, the complete car with its fifteen passengers will weigh about twelve tons, and, when completely submerged, is to have a displacement of thirty tons, that is, it would weigh two-fifths as much, bulk for bulk, as water, or better, its specific gravity would be two-fifths. Somebody seems to have made a mistake here, for, having brushed up our youthful knowledge of arithmetic a bit, and made the necessary calculations, we have found that the displacement must be very nearly sixty-seven tons instead of thirty, thus reducing the specific gravity to less than one-fifth.

The car, being let fall, would penetrate the water to a depth, depending on its velocity, its specific gravity and the friction of its surface with the water; then, through the buoyancy of the water, it would ascend to the surface, oscillate a short time up and down, and finally come to rest in a vertical position. But in order that a body of the form and specific gravity of our car float vertically, it must have its centre of gravity very low down. To test this and other points, we had a skilled assistant make us several models of different sizes, all to scale with the proposed

car, but varying in specific gravity from one-fifth to four-fifths. They were made of sheet-tin, as light as could well be worked, and ballast was used to make them float erect. In the case of the model whose specific gravity is one-fifth, our flotation experiments failed entirely; it could not be made to stand alone, and we were obliged to give it up. Still, on a larger scale it might possibly succeed. Next, one with a specific gravity of two-fifths was tried, and we found that its centre of gravity had to be at, or below, a point that would correspond, in the full-sized car, to a point twenty-eight feet from the top. In that case the car floated so that just a little more than the cylindrical part was above water, and this agrees quite closely with results obtained from calculation. We will not ask our readers to follow the calculations. It would need cooler weather.

We will now try another model, this time one whose specific gravity is four-fifths. To make it float upright we have to ballast it until its centre of gravity corresponds to a point, which, in the full-sized car, is about thirty feet from the top. Under these conditions the real car when floating freely would be immersed to a depth of forty-four and a half feet, leaving only five and a half feet of the top of the car above water. Two cars, one with a specific gravity of two-fifths, the other with one of four-fifths, would have each its own advantages and disadvantages, but we think the heavier one would be decidely the safer. With our models we noticed that the lighter one, on emerging from the water, had a strong inclination to rock violently from side to side through a very large angle. If Mr. Carron's car is to be afflicted with anything like the wild tossing of our little models, then infallibly every passenger would have his neck broken on the first trial. We do not think, however, that such would be the case, for, just as among men, large bodies always move more majestically than small ones, even when their specific gravity is the same. Another reason for preferring the heavier car is, that it would be less liable to be deflected from its course by the wind, and this might be of importance, if it is to be tried, as has been suggested, at the Columbian Fair grounds; for there seems to be a good deal of wind there pretty much all the time.

At any rate, we are ready. The great car has been raised to a height of one thousand feet above the water. The crowd of spectators is gaping, at a very respectful distance. The fifteen passengers are in their seats. (Personally we would like very much to be one of their number, but as we have some *outside* observations to make, we are obliged to wait for the second trip.) The door is securely fastened, the electric light is on, the word is given, and down they go. It will take nearly eight seconds to reach the water—the longest eight seconds probably of a life time. At the instant of reaching the water they will be travelling at the rate of over two hundred and fifty feet per second, or fully one hundred and seventy miles per hour, which is three times as fast as our express trains. Still, this need give us no alarm, for we know that mere velocity, however great, has no injurious effect, provided it be uniform, or nearly so. We are actually falling through space at the rate of about

seventy thousand miles per hour, at a pretty nearly uniform rate, and yet, as far as sensation goes, we are totally unaware of the fall. Falling *to* the earth is quite a different affair, the motion being not uniform but rapidly accelerated. When we look back through the dim vista of the distant receding years, we recall many experiments in this matter of accelerated motion. At times it was only for a short distance, the length of a cellar-door or of a stair-rail; at other times it was a more dignified affair, a half-mile or more down a snow-clad mountain-side, in the clear, crisp air of our childhood's northern home. Again, we have jumped from moderately high elevations, in the prosecution of certain natatorial experiments; and in all these cases we had a personal knowledge of how it felt. A sort of up-and down sensation, an exaltation and a depression, a feeling of helplessness in the grasp of a mighty power which we had not measured, a sense of detachment from mere mundane things, and yet a perfect consciousness that our earthly bonds were not dissolved, but that, on the contrary, they were pulling us down harder than ever. The difference between a slide down an inclined plane and a direct fall is merely in the rate at which the onward velocity increases, though the ultimate velocities may turn out to be the same; while the difference between two direct falls, from different heights, is only in the greater or less velocity finally acquired. The rate of increase of velocity (leaving out the resistance of the air) is practically the same whether a body fall a foot or a mile. Therefore, fall one foot or a thousand feet, the sensation will be the same, except that in the former case it will last but one-quarter of a second, while in the latter it will last nearly eight whole seconds. The mere descent then need give us no trouble.

A very curious phenomenon, however, would be that, with respect to the car, objects inside would have no weight, and consequently a person would not exert the least pressure on the chair or floor; he would even remain in mid-air without support, in any position whatever in which he might be placed, and, unless he could lay hold on some portion of the car, he would be unable to change his position. The slightest push in any direction would send him straight against the opposite side of the car.

Dancing could not be indulged in, and even walking about would become an impossible feat. The reason of all this is that the car and any objects within it are pulled down *independently* by the same force, viz., gravity; they start together, and their velocity increases at the same rate; or, perhaps more clearly, the earth is pulling an interior object towards the floor of the car, but at the same time it is pulling the car itself away from that object at the same rate. This peculiar condition, if continued long enough, would probably have some effect on the internal economy, on the circulation of the blood, or in other ways, simply because of its unusualness, but we think we could stand it for eight seconds. When, however, the car, on striking the water, begins to slow up, a person who had been standing on nothing in mid-air, would fall to the floor and strike it with a degree of force depending on the sud-

denness of that slow-up. His impression would not be that he had fallen; rather, he would imagine that the floor of the car had just come up and struck him. We have been told that men sometimes, under quite different circumstances, experience a similar illusion; of this we cannot speak with authority.

So far, then, we have no fear. There is not a case on record of any one having been injured by the mere act of falling. The popular notion that a person falling from a great height is dead before reaching the bottom is certainly an error. Men have often fallen from great heights into water, accidentally or intentionally, and have escaped unhurt. Even when the result has been fatal, there is no reason to believe that injury resulted *during* the fall, unless it possibly were through the nervous system, from fright. No; a fall, as such, need hurt no one; it is the too-sudden stop that does the mischief. It is precisely to obviate this that Mr. Carron gives us the heavily-cushioned chairs, the spring-supported floor, and, especially, the two hundred feet of water? Will these suffice? Let us examine this a little.

When the car strikes the water, at least three resistances, tending to retard its motion and bring it to rest, are developed. First, the buoyancy of the water, an upward thrust due to the weight of the water itself. Secondly, the resistance which the water offers to the passage of a body through it. This depends, among other things, on the density, and probably to some extent on the pressure, of the water. It is of the same kind as the resistance offered to moving bodies by the air, but is, of course, much greater. Thirdly, the surface friction between the car itself and the water. The effect of this third cause is slight and may be neglected. The effect of the first cause may be found by calculation. We have worked it out for three different cars, having respectively a a specific gravity of one-fifth, of two-fifths, and of four-fifths, and we find that, from this cause alone, the first car would come to rest at a depth of 244 feet, the second at a depth of 651 feet, the third at a depth of 3906 feet. The second cause of retardation is very difficult, if not impossible, to be reached by calculation, and sufficient experimental data are not at hand. We know that it increases with the velocity, but just in what proportion is still a matter of dispute. Still, from what is known, in a general way, of the force required to drive a torpedo through the water, and from some rather crude experiments with our models, we think the second cause would more than equal the first, and so, as a rough estimate, we will say that car No. 1 will sink to a depth of about 120 feet, No. 2 to about 300, and No. 3 to more than 1000 feet.

The ratio then of the total distance traversed in air and water, to the depth of the plunge, would be, in the three cases, as 1120 to 120, as 1300 to 300, and as 2000 to 1000; or, if we use smaller numbers, the three ratios will be as 9⅓ to 1, as 4⅓ to 1, and as 2 to 1. This represents, in each case, the magnitude of the upward pressure which one would experience, as compared with the upward pressure one feels when standing on the ground. In other words, it measures the magnitude of

the shock received. It would be as if a person were to fall a total distance of 9⅓ feet, or 4⅓ feet, or 2 feet (before coming to rest), to an ideally-elastic support, which, while exerting a uniform retarding pressure, different, of course, for the different cases, would yield, in an absolutely gradual manner, through a distance of one foot before bringing him to a full stop. This would be the greatest value of the upward pressure; but it would not be quite correct for the beginning of the retardation, since that would be somewhat less while the car is getting under water than after complete submersion. The greater the specific gravity of the car the less would be the shock, but in neither of the three cases would it be dangerous, or even disagreeable. During the descent in the water, instead of feeling lighter, as he did during the free fall, the experimenter would feel as if he had increased in weight from two to about ten fold. So far, again, all would probably go well.

Just as our natural dwelling-place is not the top of a tower, so neither is it the bottom of a well. Our car will rise again to the surface, and at this point, we believe, the real danger begins. For if the car be not balanced perfectly, or if, from any other cause, it should deviate ever so little from the vertical, during its descent in the air or in the water, that deviation would be augmented during the ascent, and on reaching the surface it would be likely to topple over, or at least to get wrestling with vacancy in a most alarming fashion. This might be fun for the car, but the passengers would look upon it in an altogether serious light. Our model No. 2 (specific gravity, two-fifths), when dropped from a sufficient height, on rising, invariably leaps clear of the surface and falls over, and only comes to rest after bowing spasmodically to all points of the compass. It is evident that, if the real car were to behave in the same way, the desire of the passengers for excitement would be more than satisfied. Model No. 3 (specific gravity, four-fifths) is more dignified in its movements, but, for a passenger-car, built on that plan, a well of immense depth would be required. In that case it might be just as well to drop it from the yard-arm of some monster ship in a nice deep spot of the Atlantic ocean.

On the whole, there seem to be some good points in the project and some bad ones; and it is hard to tell which would come out uppermost, but he surely would be a bold man who would attempt to realize it. In fine, much as we would like to see the experiment, we have not yet quite made up our mind to apply for the position either of conductor or brakeman.

SHORT NOTES.

1. Stopping Runaway Horses by Electricity.

Accidents from runaway horses are, as is well known, of frequent occurrence. Sometimes they end in a mere fright, at other times in a bruised limb, but all too often in the more serious consequences of a maiming for life, or even in death itself. Frequently it is hard to tell which of the two, the horse or the driver, is most to blame; but which-

ever it may be, anything which tends to put the balance of power in the hands of the one who holds the reins, must be of very great value. Many and various are the devices which, from time to time, have been invented and patented for this purpose. Some of them aim at a bit which, in case of emergency, may be made to act with great force on the jaws of the horse; they have doubtless saved many a life, but when a horse is fairly wild with fright, they sometimes fail. Others are intended to cramp the action of the horse's forelegs, or hinder it altogether; this is radical enough but may prove dangerous, for it is liable to throw the animal suddenly, and then the driver may be thrown out headlong and be injured, either by the fall or by the struggling horse, or by both. Another way is to have the shafts attached to the vehicle in such a manner, that by the throw of a lever they can be instantaneously detached and the horse set free, a brake being brought into requisition to stop the momentum of the carriage. Neither does this seem to be just what is wanted, for even if the occupants of the carriage escape unhurt, the frightened animal, set free from all control, is almost sure to injure some one else before he is captured, especially if it happen in a crowded thoroughfare. Again, it has been proposed to fix a piece of cloth in such a position that it may be thrown over the horse's head, thus shutting out vision; this is supposed to work, on the ground that a horse will soon stop if he cannot see the road before him. About this we feel a little skeptical; we would like to see it tried.

Now that electricity is being dragged in to attempt all things, the impossible as well as the possible, it would be strange, indeed, if some ingenious inventor did not try it for this purpose as well; and so it has been done.

In this method, the runaway horse is not stopped by main force, nor yet is he to be paralyzed by a young thunderbolt. The end is to be obtained by working on his feelings rather than on his muscles. All that is needed is a couple of cells of a dry-battery, stowed away safely under the seat of the carriage, an insulated wire from each pole of the battery to one end of the bit, so as however to come in contact with the horse's tongue at different points; and a push-button located within easy reach of the driver's hand or foot. When, now, the horse foolishly believes that all the enemies he ever made for himself are in hot pursuit behind him, you touch the button, and the little current of electricity causes a new and surprising taste in his mouth. Not having the capacity to grapple with more than one idea at a time, he forgets about the pursuing enemies and *stops* to investigate.

A variation in this device is to insert in the circuit a small shocking-coil, the action of which would surely cause a surprise not easily forgotten. It seems that this mode of stopping runaway horses has been tried with success. A mettlesome steed, just boiling over with mischief, was harnessed to a light buggy, in which the apparatus just described had been fitted up; the inventor of the device and the owner of the turn-out stepped in; the reins were thrown loose, and the horse urged on till things began to look dangerous. A touch of the button and,

after arguing with the bit for an instant, he decided to stop, and did so almost immediately. And so we have the right thing at last? We are afraid not. A horse may not be able to reason much, but what sense he has is good horse sense, and we are inclined to think that after having found himself fooled a few times, he would despise the whole trick, or mayhaps get used to it, and then come to like it and ask for more.

Before trusting too much to this new plan, we would wish to see it tried on different horses, and on the same ones several times; and then if it proved reliable, we would stand ready to record one more triumph for electricity.

2. A New Life-Saving Belt.

This is, of course, for use at sea or wherever there is danger of being drowned. It is the invention of an Italian, Mr. Rossi-Gallico. Its special advantage is that it is self-inflating, whereas the older forms have either to be kept permanently inflated or require to be "blown up" when needed for use. In the former case they are clumsy and must be kept stored out of the way. Then, when an accident calls for their use, they cannot be readily got at, or else people lose their presence of mind and cannot adjust them. In the latter case they are less reliable still, for if a person cannot keep cool enough to put on correctly a life-preserver already inflated, how can he be expected to keep cool enough to do both the inflating and the adjusting?

These disadvantages are got rid of in the new belt. It is very light, and when empty is perfectly flat, so that it can be worn without inconvenience, day and night. It contains a small quantity of some dry acid (*tartaric* will do) and the equivalent of some dry carbonate (*carbonate of soda* is good). These do not react on each other while dry, nor do they absorb moisture spontaneously, but when wetted, they react and give off a large volume of carbonic acid gas. This distends the belt and gives it buoyancy enough to keep a person well above water. A valve is so arranged that when the belt is brought in contact with water, a sufficient quantity will enter to bring about the desired action; the tension of the gas will then close the valve and hold it closed, so that there is no danger of a collapse. This automatic inflation would, however, be a great inconvenience for the sailors and officers who, being exposed to all sorts of weather, cannot keep dry till just the moment when the belt is needed. For them a special form is made in which a pull on a string is needed to open the valve, after which it works like the other. A larger pattern is also made, with clinging-ropes attached; this is intended to be thrown overboard for the benefit of persons struggling in the water. Still another form can be used from the shore, by shooting it from a mortar. A line is attached to this one, by means of which persons may be hauled ashore from a wreck, up to three-fourths of a mile away.

From experiments made with this belt in England, it seems destined to be of great service in the saving of human lives. As far as we have heard, it has not yet been exhibited in this country, but when it does come we will wish it welcome and all success.

3. Extinguishing Fires by Electricity.

If one were to believe all that has been published for the last few years, by the daily press, about electricity, one would think that its sole mission was a mission of destruction and death. All the good it has done has been sedulously kept in the background, or only grudgingly admitted, while whatever little harm could be really attributed to it, has been brought to the front, magnified and exaggerated beyond all the bounds of honesty and truth. It is hard to account for this, except on the grounds of ignorance, but the gentlemen of the press, whatever else they may do, will never plead ignorance. We can indeed understand, to some extent, how corrupt politicians, under the influence of selfishness, may learn to play fast and loose with their consciences, but that the *incorruptible* press,—save the mark,—which glories in styling itself the moulder of public opinion, the mainstay of civil and religious freedom, the defender of virtue, the scourge of vice, and all the rest of it, should descend from its lofty watch-towers to mingle with the ignoble rabble, and set an example of dishonesty and downright lying, passes all belief. Yet any one who has been ever so little behind the scenes, well knows that such is the case. Not all, indeed, of the daily journals are open to this accusation, but many, probably the majority are, and among them not a few of the largest and most influential ones. Over and over again they have boldly attributed to electricity the origin of explosions and fires, not only when such was not proved to be the fact, but often when it was clearly and officially proved not to be the fact. Well, let it pass. We trust that the innate sense of justice which belongs to the human race will, under the guidance of Providence, some day or other, set this matter right. In the meantime, we wish to draw attention to the fact that electricity may be utilized for the purpose of extinguishing instead of igniting fires.

Mr. H. F. Lufkin, a gentleman well known in electrical circles, describes, in a paper read before the National Association of Fire Engineers, an apparatus for this purpose. It may be used to protect a whole city block, or a number of them together, or, with slight modifications, as a private installation; but in either case connection must be had with the mains supplying electricity for light or power. The system may or may not be made entirely automatic, according to which is judged the more desirable.

Suppose we take as an illustration of the system one city block. In a back-yard, or anywhere out of the way, a building is erected as a pumping-station. It should be made very strong, and absolutely fireproof; not from any fear of danger from within, but in order to resist fire and walls falling on it from without. These two ends can be easily attained, since the building will be quite small and only one story high, and may be built of brick and iron, or, if preferred, entirely of soft steel, and need consist of but one room. Not a foot of wood is required in the whole structure. In this building, or room, is installed a force-pump, the suction-pipe of which is connected with the water-supply of the city, or, if possible, with an independent, unlimited supply, such as a river, lake or harbor. The delivery-pipes of this pump

may be led to every house or every room if desired, also to every outdoor hydrant; in fine, to every important point in the block. In the same little house is an electric motor, powerful enough to run the pump and keep up a sufficient pressure in the delivery-pipes, no matter how many of them are in use at the same time. The motor is joined up to the electric mains of the street, and, if possible, independently to the mains of two different companies, so that, in case of the failure of one, the other would take its place. Proper electrical communication is made from the motor to every house, or, if need be, to every room in the block, and to every hydrant in the street, at all of which push-buttons or switches are inserted. When now a fire breaks out, all that is necessary is to press one of those buttons or turn one of those switches; then the motor turns, the pump starts, and the water in the delivery-pipes is under pressure and ready for use. The same touch of the button may be made to call out the firemen of the district, who, arriving with their usual promptness, and finding an abundance of water under pressure, have nothing to do but put the fire out, or, perhaps, before they come "you can do it yourself." If it was a false alarm, no harm has been done except the useless calling out the firemen.

Furthermore, if desired, the switches, especially at important points, may be made to work automatically through the means of a thermostat, thus rendering security doubly secure. The thermostat could be made not only to start the motor, but also to open the valves of an automatic sprinkler, to be supplemented afterwards by the hose, if necessary. The simplicity of this plan recommends it strongly wherever electric plants are in continuous operation, and it need not be confined to a single block. But let us listen to Mr. Lufkin: "A plant of this character, with a capacity of 200 horse-power, which would be capable of delivering about 2500 to 3000 gallons of water per minute, say 165,000 gallons per hour, against 150 pounds pressure, could be set up and piped to cover quite a number of city blocks, say ten or fifteen, at an expense of $20,000. The cost to operate this plant at its full capacity would not exceed ten dollars per hour, or at the rate of 16,500 gallons of water for every dollar of cost. When the fire is out the cost stops absolutely. The wear-and-tear expense on a large plant of this kind should not be as great as on a single steam fire-engine, to say nothing of maintaining horses and harness."

The engines would, of course, be no longer needed, but horses and harness for hook and ladder and for hose carts would still be required. The cost of the electricity and the care of the plant would be very small, while the security offered would be vastly greater than we now enjoy.

In the case of theatres, public halls, churches, and the like, an isolated plant might be used, in which case the automatic arrangements would be the safest. The motor and pump would easily find a place in the cellar or basement, though it would be better, if circumstance would allow, to have them in a building apart, with underground connections for pipes and wires.

On the whole, this system seems to offer the best solution yet known to the problem of how to preserve our cities from the ravages of fire.

Book Notices.

ACTS OF ENGLISH MARTYRS, HITHERTO UNPUBLISHED. By *John Hungerford Pollen, S. J.* With a Preface by John Morris, of the same Society. London: Burns & Oates. 1891.

This beautiful book is a contribution towards the still unwritten "Lives of the English Martyrs." And a valuable contribution it is; valuable to the Catholic who would enliven his devotion and strengthen his faith; valuable to the man or woman who would, in a small and selfish world, often recall the heroic deeds of simple folk amid great trials and temptations; valuable for the student of English history on account of the many curious details of men and manners here recorded. Not a single document in the volume has been elsewhere published. Many public and private MSS. collections have been ransacked in order to make as complete as possible this volume of "Acts." In the British Museum, the Bodleian, the Privy Council Registers, the Public Record Office; at Stoneyhurst, Oscott, Westminster, Fiesole, Nymphenburg, Father Pollen has gleaned. He could, perhaps, have done more were it not for the unenlightened policy of some of the English officials. Reading a passage in Father John Morris's preface, we could not but think of the warm protests that were for many years published, at becoming intervals, in the English literary journals—protests against the "obscurantism" of the Papacy, because it would not throw open its collections to "scholardom." Here are the words of Father Morris (pp. xii., xiii.): "The Privy Council Books, at Whitehall, can be seen, but they are far more difficult of access than the State Papers in the Record Office. We must be thankful for what we have obtained, but the editor of this volume met with what would seem to be needless obstruction when, in his search for purely literary purposes, he was not allowed to make any complete transcript." Will not the liberal-minded editors of the Athenæum and the Academy join us in reprobating the quite too unmodern obscurantism of the British crown? Or, is there an English scholardom that cares not for all its brethren at home, but only watches over those who are hampered while abroad?

Father John Pollen has brought to light not only new documents but new books also, books forgotten, perhaps wholly lost, some of which, indeed, there is no known record of. Persecuted as the English Catholics were, they found and took ways and means to print the doings of the men and women who were true to the Church of Christ, as well as to defend the old faith, and to confound the teachers of the new state-worship which was forced on the people by such inhuman means. As we run over those records of a shameful past, we cannot but exclaim: As the Lord liveth, when once the people, great and small, come to know the heroism of these their countrymen, and the horrible injustice done them, for conscience's sake, they will not merely throw off the religion made of tyrannous princes and their knavish counsellors, but they will enthusiastically return to the Church of the people! To think otherwise, would be to deny to the English people the nobility of sentiment that, thanks to the Saviour, is ever kept alive among those who suffer most.

Literary men will be interested in the "Brief of the Life and Death of Sir Edmund Campion," a poem written probably within six months after his death. Though not a great work, the poem is characteristic of the time, quaint in form and expression, powerful in parts, and with more

than one line worthy of being quoted. Take the following stanza, for instance, which has the true Elizabethan flavor:

"If virtue ever live, if valor never die,
If learned arts forever stand with grace eternally,
If perfect life get fame, if perfect fame endure,
If endless durance make us live, and set our honor sure,
If constance earn a crown, if conquest join the gain,
If learning armed with godly life do evermore remain,
If ardent thirst for souls, if aged acts in youth,
If for to sweat and die the death for the Eternal truth,
If martyrs purchase life, if meekness last in praise,
If charity of highest degree do flourish green always,
If mind invincible do ever blaze and bide,
If all the gifts of manly mind, and virtues therein tried:
Then is not Edmund dead, but gone to bliss before,
He lives among the sacred saints and reigns forevermore."

At page 194–207, Father Pollen prints "The Song of the Death of Mr. Thewlis," from MSS. in the British Museum, and "The Song which Mr. Thewlis Writ for Himself." The former, in a north-country dialect, was evidently a "popular" song, and is in many ways instructive. There is some art and much feeling in the opening stanzas of the first part, and in the second stanza of the second part:

"O God above relent,
And listen to our cry;
O Christ, our woes prevent,
Let not thy children die.

"O God above relent,
And listen to our cry,
Sweet Christ thy spouse defend
From tyrants's crueltie."

In the "Song which Mr. Thewlis Writ for Himself," there are several stanzas that would bear quoting as illustrating the life of a hunted priest during the first quarter of the seventeenth century, but we shall select two that testify rather to the spirit of the men who were doomed to the rope and the knife:

"The saints also did suffer death,
And martyrs as you hear,
And I myself am now at hand,
And death I do not fear.
Then have I trust of greater grace
Unto my soul will bring,
Where we shall meet, both face to face,
Before our heavenly King.

"No hurdle hard, nor hempen rope
Can make me once afraid,
No tyrant's knife against my life
Shall make me dismayed.
Though flesh and bones be broken and torn
My soul I trust will sing,
Amongst the glorious companie,
With Christ our heavenly King."

If there were a persecution actually here in these United States; if the law condemned to the halter and the butcher's knife, every Catholic that heard or said Mass, or that received or confessed a sacrament, or

that failed to attend a Protestant service—would you go to jail, zealous reader? Would you confess your faith courageously on the scaffold? Would you stand firm as the State-assassin carved up the living body of your friend before your eyes, and hurried the work that he might rip the heart out, smoking hot? God knows! You need not be old in order to know that the world is always full of fair-weather friends; nor need you fear to infer that it is, even now, equally filled with fair-weather Catholics. How easy it is to be bold when neither life nor interest are at stake! Why ask these untimely questions? Are they untimely? *Would you guarantee that what has been shall not be? Read history!* However sure or uncertain about our own constancy under trial, we cannot be surprised at reading here of priests and laymen who were weak, and so bartered Christ for life; nor can we help being moved at the story of many who, having failed to-day, had grace and strength to-morrow, and calmly died for the Saviour's sake. How the conscience of a nineteenth-century-Anglican must appeal to him as he reads the words of John Roberto, who never failed? "Dearly beloved friends," said he to the crowd that had gathered around the gibbet on which he was soon to hang, "I am here to die in the presence of God and His angels and of the saints of Paradise, because being a priest, I returned to this country in spite of a statute passed in the 27th year of the late queen's reign which declared this to be high treason. I have committed no fault except this, if this be indeed a fault; nor have I even been charged with any other offence. I die therefore for my faith, and for my faith only, that same faith, I say, which St. Augustine, the Apostle of England, preached when he converted this country from idolatry. The vows of my Order, and the habit I wear, are the same as his, and I observe the same rule and live in the same religious Order as he did. I teach the same faith that he taught. As he delivered you from paganism, so I have tried to deliver you from heresy. I affirmed this before the judges at my trial, and I repeat it to you now in this place where I am about to seal my testimony with my blood." Either John Roberto was sadly mistaken about his faith, or there are many who owe no thanks to "the late queen."

We are tempted to quote the whole book of Father Pollen, but after noting one other affecting incident, we must leave the "Acts" to the reader. Edward Morgan suffered at Tyburn, April 26, 1642. Like many another victim, he had to defend himself, on the scaffold, against the dull argumentation of a minister, who, with a fine intellectual sense, suggested to him to "put his trust in the merits of the Lord, and not in angels and saints." Mr. Morgan answered: "Mistake not yourself, sir, for I put my whole trust and confidence in the infinite merits of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, Who died for me." "That is well said," the minister replied, and let him alone. Going to the hangman with a merry countenance, Edward Morgan gave him a piece of money and wished him to do his office; and as the hangman sought to arrange him in a suitable posture, Morgan said to him: "I pray thee, teach me, for I never was at this sport before." "Mr. Morgan," said the minister, "this is nor a time to sport, nor is it a jesting matter." "Sir," said Mr. Morgan, "I know it is not a jest, but good sober earnest; but you cannot deny but that God requireth a cheerful sacrifice, and I hope it is no offence to you and these good people that I go cheerfully and merrily to Heaven." God bless thee, John Morgan! Did each one of us daily recall your very Christian teaching, what a merry world this would be! It is not merry, because cheerful sacrifice is not a principle of the current philosophies, or professions of faith or political economies, and yet,

without cheerful sacrifice, there can be neither merry living nor holy dying.

The "Reading Circles" are doing good work; so are the young men's societies, and the Church library associations. To them we heartily recommend this loving work of Father John Pollen. The most learned as the most simple, the most devout as the most worthy, will read it with interest and with advantage. Spread the good books! Spread the good books! Spread the good books!

LIFE OF FATHER CHARLES SIRE, of the Society of Jesus. By his brother, *Rev. Vital Sire.* Translated from the French. Benziger Brothers.

Upon that great secret of God, His employment of suffering, weakness, and other things that seem to stand in the way of human hopes and ambitions, as the most blessed means of recalling errant humanity back to Himself and His love, those who read this book must ponder, if with much of sympathy, with more of gratitude. Virtues made manifest by activity, curious as it seems, are less attractive to us than the uncomplaining submission of the weak. Tears of compassion are sweeter than the most fervid admiration for the heroic; and many an occasion for the shedding of these is in this record made by a loving brother of a brief life eventful only by aims which Heaven saw that it was good to disappoint.

Charles Sire was one of eight sons, seven of whom became priests. The fruitful mother, on the day of his birth, consecrated to the Blessed Virgin, this, her youngest, who was to be the brightest among the jewels in her crown of maternal glory. That was indeed a "fortunate day," as he used to call it, Christmas of 1828, when, four days old, he was brought to the baptismal font. It is delightful to read of that innocent childhood in the village of St. Jvry, particularly of its influence upon Catharine Beillard, a peasant mother of a family, and their consequent friendship, some of whose fruits were destined to be miraculous. A sanctuary-boy at seven years of age, at ten passed over in catechism examinations because known by his pastor to be already as well instructed as himself, it was easy to foresee that he had been chosen for a high career. Not less interesting was his life at the Preparatory Seminary of Polignan, where, as a pupil, and as a member of each of the sodalities, *St. Aloysius Gonzaga* (for all the lay students and such members of the lower classes as wore the cassock), *The Holy Angels* (for the ecclesiastics of the Fifth, Fourth and Third), and *The Blessed Virgin* (for admission of only the most pious of the Second and Rhetoric) he won all hearts. After seven years of sojourn, sad even to tears he left it for the Seminary at Toulouse. "I had found it," he said, "such a blessing to be in a house where reigned innocence, recollection and fervor, and where the Blessed Virgin had granted to me so many favors."

Immediately after leaving he made a pilgrimage to *Our Lady of Garaison*, whose shrine at that time (before the *Apparition* at Lourdes) was the most frequented of all within that region. It was to pray her counsel and guidance in the life that he was to lead in Toulouse. Already with the judgment which sometimes is given to childhood and youth, he had adopted that wise maxim of St. John Berchman, "For me the best of all penances shall be the ordinary life."

Perhaps no man, no saint was ever more guarded against disturbing influences, or more recollected in the thoughts which it was his duty to cultivate. Not gifted with extraordinary genius, naturally subject to lassitude that seemed like indolence, he overcame this, not by irregular,

violent effort, but by study, trustful pursuit of counsels imparted by the Blessed Virgin, whom for so long he had humbly invoked. It was when he had just finished the *Fourth Latin* at Polignan that an elder brother entered among the Sulpicians. Then it was that "he was filled with holy envy, and promised himself to imitate this example, were it the will of God."

One cannot but be touched while reading about the things which for a time seemed destined to prevent his union with the Jesuits, infirmity of the body, and temporary misunderstanding of his own choice of vocation. In this while the friendship between him and Catharine had developed into fondest affection. Prior to his appearing before the Novice-master at Toulouse, with this humble friend he had made two Novenas in honor of JESUS, Mary and Joseph, which were consummated by Holy Communion and pilgrimages to *Our Lady of Good Gift*, and *Our Lady of the Heath*. In his notes, written on the eve of application, he said, "The result of these two Novenas has been to me great consolation of heart, and an ardent desire of making a spiritual Retreat, and applying at once for admission to this society." . . . "I feel that God calls me to live in the Society of Jesus." . . . "There to find a remedy for those waverings of spirit that ever beset me after striving after the most perfect, and knowing not which to choose. There also to obtain an antidote for my sloth and indolence of disposition."

In this little book are some things that one can hardly read without tears. It had not been easy to obtain the consent of his parents. His mother's heart was wrung at the parting from this her youngest, who, in the priesthood sought by him, was to be separated from her even further than the rest of his brethren. In a letter to one of the older, besides many other words, are these: "The poor child! But one thing troubled him; to see me so sad. I was indeed overwhelmed. The sacrifice seemed beyond my strength. I was truly grieved when you left us for St. Sulpice, you and Dominique; but that sacrifice was nothing to this; for I could at least see you occasionally. But a Jesuit! He is lost, as it were, to his family; he returns to them no more. Oh! the thought is crushing! Charles did his best to console me, seeking my presence, and saying all manner of kind and gentle words." . . . "I would smile, but with a heavy heart." . . . "I accompanied him to the boat. Poor child! it was on the water's edge I left him." . . . "He seemed delighted when, as we were awaiting the boat, I related to him that I had consecrated him to Mary on the day of his baptism, and in what manner. It was the first time that I had ever mentioned it to him."

Most fair was that scene, a stripling leaving that dear home with no words except those meant to console the mother whose heart was breaking at the separation, and going with joyousness whither he had already resolved to prefer what nature most abhors, and fly from what it seeks most eagerly. It is possible to submit to inevitable poverty without complaint; but it is above nature to love it, as Charles Sire loved it, to call it his good mother, his faithful companion, his beloved."

Among those who have lived lives of special devoutness are individual peculiarities which lead some to one, and others to another kind of specially fond invocations. To this young Jesuit fond were those to JESUS, Mary and Joseph; but perhaps his most frequent was to his guardian angel. His first in the morning, his last at night were to charge his good angel with some commission. Twice in the profound silence of night he was awakened at appointed hours, in order to lift his thoughts and send his petitions to Heaven. Happy he who in youth can say as this boy

was wont, when speaking of the commissions trusted to this blessed messenger, "Never, never did he fail to execute them."

That he should have been satisfied, even pleased with assignment to a foreign apostolate was but another honoring of his vow to seek the things that are most repugnant to nature. The sudden call to prepare himself for the Island of Bourbon in the Indian Ocean, even before he had taken clerical orders, startled him; but almost immediately afterwards, he responded with alacrity. The ceremonies of orders were hastened, after which he wrote thus to his brother Vital: "As for myself, I am both happy and proud at thoughts of this double elevation, to the priesthood, and the mission to Bourbon; and I love to believe that, far from opposing my departure (which will not take place for a month) you will beg our Lord to confirm my superior's decisions, and advise me how to prepare my parents for the sacrifice."

Tears, still more compassionate, must flow at the parting, the second, the final. Touching was that of Catharine, with whom he had lived, and with whom he was to live ever thereafter in unity of prayer. But with his mother! We know of not one so sad, because of no remonstrance. She said, "I make this sacrifice which rends my soul; but I make it only to please God." They parted at the feet of the Blessed Virgin, in the Church of St. Servin, the signal being the handing a picture to his mother by the missionary. Only God knows all the anguish, with which, when he was moving towards the threshold, she rose and, crying, "I cannot"! started to follow. Only God could have imparted to him the strength to wave her back with promise of the blessedness it would be to her to relinquish a son to martyrdom. Then she stopped, and saying, "Adieu, my son, adieu!" followed only with her eyes as he went forever out of their sight.

It would prolong too far this notice to refer to the brief sojourn at this far distant mission, the quick succumbing to that fearful climate, the re-embarking for France, the continued decline, the mute devotions, full of sweetest expression when the powers of utterance and movement were exhausted, the peaceful death in the silence of night, the burial in the bosom of the sea. Yet in that silence Catharine Beillard, two thousand leagues away, heard as, with the crucifix in his hand, he murmured "All for Jesus, through Mary!" Two persons, unseen of all except her, were beside him, and one of these, a Lady clothed in white, with a black veil thrown over her head, placed a crown of white roses upon his brow.

It was a beautiful life. Few can read its record without having many emotions, among them, thankfulness for so signal a manifestation of the endurance, that richest of earthly inheritances, which Heaven imparts to the meek of this world. Richard Malcolm Johnston.

Les Chartes Coloniales et les Constitutions des États-Unis de L'Amérique Du Nord. Par Alphonse Gourd. 2 vols. Paris.

Reviewing M. Auguste Carlier's able work on American institutions, in the April number of this Review, we called the attention of our readers to the intelligent interest shown of late by Europeans, and especially by Frenchmen, in our history and in our polity. M. Gourd's volumes are but another proof of the interest of French students in things American and of the serious methods they follow. Like M. Carlier and M. Claudio Jannet, M. Alphonse Gourd has had a practical acquaintance with America and Americans; indeed were it not that he insists on being a Frenchman we would willingly claim him as an American. His

experience of our institutions has made him all the more competent to deal with the important subjects discussed in these two volumes. Is there a Society of Comparative Legisiation in the United States? In France there is, fortunately, such a society; and to its enterprise we are indebted for M. Gourd's book, which bears the imprint of the French government and is printed at public expense.

On parle des Etats Unis plus qu'on ne les connaît, says M. Gourd, with truth, in his "Introduction;" but he has made sure that this criticism cannot be passed on those who read his two volumes. Having, in the course of forty pages, given a summary of all the voyages of exploration that preceded the permanent settlement of North America by Europeans, M. Gourd takes up the English foundations, and sketches the history of the establishment of the thirteen English colonies. It is with their political history that he has especially to do, and therefore he studies, one by one, the separate charters under which the colonies were organized, and the systems of government that were set up by the colonists. Whatever modifications were made in the original charters he notes and explains; whatever changes were effected from time to time in the forms of the colonial governments, he describes with all the detail necessary to a full understanding of the circumstances, and of the scope of the various modifications. M. Gourd wastes no words. He is curt, close, exact; and every statement is fortified by a substantial authority. Our present democracy was not that of the colonists; and M. Gourd brings out this fact clearly, not by a reasoned argument, but by a careful account of our early institutions, by a minute analysis of the different charters, and by insisting on each step of the progress of democratic ideas. To these valuable chapters, which M. Gourd modestly calls "Notices Historiques," he adds a collection of original documents: the first letters-patent of Columbus; the Bull issued by Pope Alexander VI. to Ferdinand and Isabella (May 4, 1493); letters-patent granted to Cabot and Roberval; Jacques Cartier's Commission; the first and second Acadian Charters; the New Plymouth "convention," and a number of the Colonial Charters.

In his second volume the learned author makes a study of the public law of the colonies; of the object and extent of the legislative, executive and judicial authorities. We cannot commend this portion of his work too highly, showing as it does the most patient research and the most skilful analysis. Explaining first the division of the powers, and the mutual relations of the people, proprietors, king and parliament, M. Gourd proceeds to a consideration of the colonial assemblies, of how they were constituted, of the requirements for membership in these bodies, and of the laws regulating their meeting and their deliberations. The powers and duties of the colonial governors and lieutenant-governors, of the councils, sheriffs, aldermen, constables, selectmen, watchmen, treasurers, and the laws referring to these and to all other executive officers are next set forth. In this section, as well as in the following sections, M. Gourd has done good service by a comparison between the the Colonial and the English systems. Treating of the judiciary of the colonies, M. Gourd follows the same lines—setting forth first the division of the judicial powers between the king, the proprietors, the governor, the council, and the various superior and inferior courts. The requirements for jurors, the regulations determining their deliberations, the machinery of the superior and inferior courts, the rules of procedure, crimes and their penalties, are studied with the elaboration of detail that marks the whole of M. Gourd's work; and comparison is again made between English and colonial methods. Nor is the completeness

of the French jurist's work less apparent in the last section of this volume, where he considers the charter regulations, or the laws, governing the various classes of society—proprietors and proprietary companies, slaves and freemen, the poor, landholders and the clergy. Every question connected with each of these classes receives thorough consideration—tenures, the right of succession, taxation, oaths, elections, marriage, tolerance, public instruction, the liberty of the press—to name but a few of the many subjects discussed here with reference to colonial law and to the law of the mother-country.

The conclusions drawn by M. Gourd, from the study of his long and precise investigations, are not to be overlooked. The colonies, he says, were new, in the sense that they were new-born communities; but they were not new, in the sense that they established, at once, a novelty in government. Sprung from England, it was English ideas and usages that the colonists brought with them—the ideas and usages of an old nation. These they modified to suit the circumstances by which they were confronted. "It was as if the English nation, with all its native qualities and customs, had been transported beyond the sea. England it is that is being perpetuated in a new land." This conclusion deserves attention. Undoubtedly just, it will save the student of colonial history from the difficulties that he will encounter on every page, if he starts out with the idea that, when the colonists first put foot on American soil, they forgot all they had been taught, and were miraculously supplied with a fund of wholly new ideas. Evolution there was, slow, painfully slow, we say, as we follow M. Gourd in his patient study of facts and acts, but no astounding revolution.

We have only one fault to find with this book—it is not written in English, and so cannot circulate as widely among Americans as among Frenchmen. As a book of reference it will be invaluable. Students of American history, and of American law, will find it of rare service to them. There is not an American work that we know of which offers the inquirer so complete a summary of information absolutely necessary to an intelligent understanding of the development of American institutions. It is not in France alone that the United States are more talked about than known. There are Americans who are none too well informed about the polity of the United States. However, even the best informed men will derive benefit from the use of these scholarly volumes, and we gladly commend them to the special and to the general reader.

MEDITATIONS ON THE GOSPELS FOR EVERY DAY IN THE YEAR. By *Père Médaille, S. J.* Translated into English under the direction of the Rev. W. N. Eyre, S.J. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. $1.60.

Father Médaille was a French Jesuit who for thirty years labored zealously as preacher and confessor for the salvation of souls. He died in 1709. His meditations on the Gospels have been translated into Latin, Italian, Spanish, German and Dutch. This is the first English translation. Almost forty editions of the work have thus far been published. This is evident proof of its merit. It reminds us of Father Avancini's "Life and Doctrine of Jesus Christ," taken from the four Gospels. Like Avancini, Father Médaille gives us three very short points for each meditation, each point enforcing one pregnant truth. We open the book at random and give the meditation for Tuesday after the eighth Sunday after Pentecost: "Give an account of thy stewardship: I. Point. We shall be examined *as to the evil which we have done.* We must not hold ourselves so strongly assured of the forgiveness of

our past sins, as not to be in continual fear: *Noli esse sine metu.* And then, too, God will make strict inquiry into the sins which we daily commit. He will unveil each one of them; He will condemn and punish each, unless we punish them ourselves. If their enormity does not alarm us, their number should do so. II. Point. We shall be examined *as to the good we ought to have done, and which we have not done.* To how many obligations have we been wanting? How many acts of virtue, how many good works have been omitted? How many graces have been neglected? How many opportunities of sanctifying ourselves have been entirely lost? We shall be constrained to confess that for every good deed which we have done, we have left undone a thousand. III. Point. We shall be examined *as to the good which we have done.* We shall have to give an account of our good works, because we did them badly: *Ego justitias judicabo*, God says. We have prayed, fasted, frequented the Sacraments and if Religious, have kept our vows and our rules; but with how much negligence, lukewarmness, cowardice, indevotion and self-love, have we done this good? In order to be justified before God, it is not enough to do good, we must do it well, says the Wise Man. *Qui custodierint justa, juste justificabuntur.*" This meditation, so terse, so practical, so suggestive, shows the pious author's method of treating each of the Gospel-truths. The book therefore needs no words of approval. It is a favorite with the Jesuits themselves. It is a good sign in our day to see such works published; for it shows that the habit of mental prayer is spreading also amongst the devout laity. They cannot complain that the proper spiritual food is now wanting to them. With Goffine for the epistles and Gospels of the Sundays and festivals, with Challoner, Crasset, Da Ponte, Avancini and Mé laille for meditations on the Gospels in general, they have what must suit every kind of spiritual taste. For the clergy we know no three works better suited for short sermons than Crasset, Avancini and Mé laille; while for the laity, we would say by all means have either Avancini or Mé laille. If only ten or fifteen minutes each day were devoted to one of these short meditations, what immense spiritual progress would be made. The saints all declare that mental prayer or meditation is necessary for sanctification. Learn of me, for I am meek and humble of heart, says Jesus Christ, and how can we learn the lesson unless we meditate on the Gospel truths. This work of Father Médaille has this great advantage, that the Gospels are contemplated in the order of the Church's festivals and liturgy, beginning with the Precursor of Christ and ending with the fulness of Pentecostal grace. We bespeak for it a cordial welcome from both clergy, religious and laity. It deserves all praise.

A Christian Apology. By *Paul Schanz, D.D., Ph.*, Professor of Theology at the University of Tübingen. Translated by Rev. Michael D. Glancey, Inspector of schools in the Diocese of Birmingham, and Rev. Victor J. Schobel, D.D., Professor of Dogmatic Theology at St. Mary's, Ascott. In three volumes. Vol. i., God and Nature. 1891. Fr. Pustet & Co.: New York and Cincinnati.

This clearly is an excellent work. Indeed, in our opinion, it is the best of its kind yet given us in the English language. It is moreover a much needed work and will undoubtedly be greatly appreciated by thinking earnest Christians throughout the land. There is no disguising the fact, that at the present day science—so-called—which ought to be the handmaid of religion, deepening men's reverence, and feeding and quickening what is noblest in their nature, is employed to weaken the faith of men and loosen their grasp on the unseen and eternal. With a

large class of men at the present time, it is science not for the sake of science, not for its own beauty and attractiveness, but as a weapon with which to assail religion. That is the spur that doth prick the sides of their intent and for which they toil and labor with a diligence and an earnestness worthy a nobler cause. It is certainly a thing to be deplored, and for a twofold reason. First, for science's own sake; and secondly, for religion's sake. It is deplorable on the side of science, for it degrades science in the esteem of men. They look upon it as prejudicial and hostile to all that is near and dear to them and hence will not trust it. It is moreover deplorable from religion's side of the case; for notwithstanding that men will not place their trust in science avowedly antagonistic to faith and its institutions, nevertheless that very hostility and irreverence on the part of science will lesson their respect for religion and, in greater or less measure, diminish its influence for good. Hence, to undo this evil, the necessity of works like the one before us. True science, we know, can never contradict the revealed word of God; what is scientifically true cannot be religiously false, for God is the author of science, as well as of revelation and He cannot contradict Himself.

Therefore, if we would guard our faith, we must know true science and be able to distinguish it from the false theories and speculations of men however eminent. A great deal passes under that name which in reality is not science. Theories and hypotheses are among the most useful instruments of scientific discovery, but they are not science. What is true science? What are its relations to revealed religion? Has it yet led to discoveries that are calculated to weaken our faith? Does it lead us in harmony with revealed religion to acknowledge a God, supreme and eternal, from whom are all things and in whom they move and have their being? Of all these things, of man's origin, of life, of the soul, of creation, does Dr. Schanz's work treat most learnedly and exhaustively. And therefore should it be known and studied by all who love their faith and would advance the glory and interests of God on earth.

As yet we have but this, the first volume of the work. The two coming volumes are equally important, and we have heard equally thorough and learned. We trust they shall be given us soon and promise for them a ready and high appreciation.

THE CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD. A Life of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. By the *Abbe Constant Fouard*. Translated from the Fifth Edition with the author's sanction by George F. X. Griffith. With an introduction by Cardinal Manning. New York and London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1891.

The author of this work has correctly described it as "an Act of Faith." He has deliberately excluded controversy from his pages. For, as he well says, the Gospels combated at a thousand points, have triumphed over their critics. . . . What is left for this generation, unless it be to avail ourselves of the inspired Witnesses and by drawing from them an account of the actions of Jesus, demonstrate that He, whose death some have published to the world, lives still, is indeed the very Life itself? . . . We only desire to make the Saviour better known and loved."

In accordance with this thought the learned author abstains from restating the proofs of the authenticity, veracity and divine inspiration of the Record of our Saviour's life on earth. He deems it wiser to refer the reader to the apologists who have triumphantly defended them. For, "written by the Spirit of God, independently of each other," the

Gospels "shine forth in the white light of truth which nothing can obscure."

In the selection of the guides whom he should follow the Abbe Fouard names, as first and most trustworthy, the Gospel itself, read in the original tongue which the sacred historians employed; next, the translations by disciples of the Apostles. Then the first Fathers of the Church must be consulted, for their preaching "is little more than a commentary upon the Good Tidings reproducing the Gospel for us, almost in its entirety; and consequently we can reconstruct from their homilies so many versions ante-dating any which we know to-day." Accordingly the author closely follows sacred tradition in interpreting those words of our Saviour which are the immovable foundation of Christian dogma.

Yet, as the author says, it is not enough in a Life of Christ to set forth the Evangelical Doctrine; it is necessary to learn from contemporary history what thoughts then occupied men's minds, and what manner of people they were among whom Jesus lived.

For the successful realization of his pious purpose Abbe Fouard possesses rare advantages. He is known throughout all Europe as an eminent Hellenist and Hebraist. He has carefully studied the Aramaic Paraphrases, the traditions contained in the Talmud and the Jewish writers; and also the discoveries recently made in Egypt, Assyria and Judea, which have revealed the secrets of their institutions.

The result of these labors on the part of Abbe Fouard is the work before us. It has been highly commended by the Sovereign Pontiff, Leo XIII.; by His Eminence Cardinal Manning, and by other distinguished ecclesiastics and scholars.

LIFE AND WRITINGS OF SIR THOMAS MORE, Lord Chancellor of England, and Martyr under Henry VIII. By the *Rev. T. E. Bridgett*, of the Congregation of the Holy Redeemer. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates. 1891.

Among all those who suffered death for the faith, in England, under King Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth, from 1535 to 1583, and who have been declared Blessed by the Holy See, there is no one who is universally more warmly esteemed than Sir Thomas More, Lord Chancellor of England. Every historian, of even the slightest pretentions to accuracy and fairness, and however bigoted or prejudiced in other respects, who has written about Henry VIII., when referring to Sir Thomas More, testifies to his amiability, his sincerity, unswerving honesty of intention and purpose, unimpeachable integrity, gentleness, disinterestedness, sagacity, prudence, learning, gentle wit, truthfulness and love of truth, which no threats on the part of a tyrannical despot or fear of torture or death, could cause him to swerve from, in even the slightest degree. Yet he was not an austere ascetic, or stern reprover of the sins of others. He was simply a prudent, gifted, learned, virtuous, English gentleman, who discharged the duties of high offices thrust upon him rather than sought by him, with singular fidelity and efficiency, and who, when dismissed from office, gladly retired from public view, and endeavored to lead a quiet, peaceable, Christian life.

That such a man should be dragged from the obscurity he courted, compelled by the subservient tools of Henry VIII. to disclose his disapproval of the licentiousness and tyranny of that brutal despot; that such a man should be sought out and put to death for no other cause than that of truth and justice, served at the time to reveal, and has ever since served to reveal, to the English public mind, the real character of

Henry VIII., more clearly than almost any other of the crimes he perpetrated.

The work before us is not an indiscriminating panegyric of Sir Thomas More, nor a repetition of what others have written about him. It is a careful exhibit of what he was, and said, and did, after a laborious, pains-taking study of original sources of information, and of State papers, many of which have only recently become accessible.

How to Get On. By *Rev. Bernard Feeney*, Author of "Lessons from the Passion," Home Duties, etc. With Preface by Most Rev. W. H. Gross, D.D., C. SS. R., Archbishop of Oregon. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1891.

Most earnestly would we desire were it possible to realize our wish, that this little book, were placed in the hands of every school-boy and young man in our country. As the Most Rev. Archbishop Gross has well said, "energy and strength of purpose are eminently characteristic of the American people." But strength of purpose, unless combined with prudence and moderation, becomes obstinacy, and energy if misdirected does harm instead of good both to the possessor and those with whom he is brought into contact. To subserve the design of our Creator in endowing us with free will and energy, these admirable qualities must be guided into proper paths and employed for the attainment of noble objects.

This was plainly the thought which impelled the author of this book to write it. The titles of the first three chapters following the introduction, sufficiently indicate the author's general plan. They are: "A High Ideal;" "Be Determined to Succeed; Some Ways and Means of Success." The main body of the book is made up of statements and explanations of these means of success. These statements and the author's comments upon them are so practical and judicious, that we give them in the order in which they occur at the head of the successive chapters. They are: A Healthy Tone of Mind; Cheerfulness; Love of Home; Recreation; Curb the Passions; Intemperance; Gambling, etc.; Gold Worship; Pride and Ambition; Sloth; Some other Vices; Independence of Character; Kindliness, Mental Culture; Life Spiritualized; Why We Believe; Loyalty to the Church; Final Suggestions.

The manner in which the author illustrates and enforces his suggestions is eminently happy. Anecdote, story, dialogue, and explanation and argument are in turn so resorted to that every chapter is attractive and entertaining as well as instructive. There is not a dry or tedious page in the whole volume. We commend it most warmly to parents as an excellent book to present to their children.

Abaelardo. 1121 zu Soissons verurtheilter *Tractatus de unitate et trinitate divina*. Aufgefunden und erstmals herausgegeben von *Dr. Remigius Stölzle*, Professor der Philosophie zu Würzburg. Freiburg im Breisgau. 1891. St. Louis: Herder. Price, $1.00.

Professor Stölzle publishes this Tractatus as the original document of Abelard, which was condemned in the Council of Soissons in 1121. He discovered it amongst the manuscripts preserved in the Library of the University of Erlangen, bound up in one volume with three other manuscripts on theological subjects. The "Theologia Christiana," by Abelard, had long been well known to critics. It was this work which met with such opposition from the great St. Bernard, which was brought

before the Council of Sens, and which Abelard came personally to defend before that council and in the presence of a host of his disciples. This controversy between the great Saint Bernard and the renowned philosopher has become historic. Abelard was unable to answer the arguments of the Saint, and his doctrine was condemned by the Fathers of the Council (1140). He appealed to the Pope, and again the decision was adverse. He then retired to the monastery of Peter of Cluny, where he remained till his death, a few years afterwards. We would have, therefore, three works of Abelard on theology: (*a*) This "Tractatus de Unitate et Trinitate Divina," of the year 1121; (*b*) the "Theologia Christiana," which is an enlarged defence of the treatise of 1121; (*c*) and the "Introductio ad Theologiam," which was published in 1141, after the condemnation by the Council of Sens. In a learned introduction our author defends the authenticity of this manuscript as the first work on theology published by Abelard which brought on him the censure of ecclesiastical authority. This work is entirely critical, and one of its principal results will be the correction of many errors contained in the larger work· "Theologia Christiana."

THE CHRISTIAN VIRGIN IN HER FAMILY AND IN THE WORLD. HER VIRTUES AND HER MISSION AT THE PRESENT TIME. London: Burns & Oates. New York. Catholic Publication Society.

The pious authoress of this work does not give us her name. She writes with enthusiastic love of her subject for those of her own sex, especially in France, but we feel sure her words will be welcomed and treasured by devout souls everywhere.

It is truly a most timely work, filling a void, and supplying a want which many must often have lamented and which she herself says would have been of priceless advantage to her own soul, had any one come to her assistance in the same way. It is a most practical work, as well, showing how in every age, the Christian virgin has had a noble mission, a sublime vocation, outside the convent walls; that very frequently she can do far more for God's glory and the good of souls by living in the world, by remaining in the family circle, by mingling in society and by her work, by her example, by her conversation, by the sweet odor of her virtues, making religion and faith and the Church attractive to souls that could not be otherwise reached.

The book is divided into four parts: (*a*) Virginity in the World; (*b*) Jesus Christ, Spouse of Virgins; (*c*) Virtues and Mission of a Virgin in the World; with an appendix on Widowhood; (*d*) Practices of Devotion for a Virgin living in the world.

The work is full of sound doctrine, illustrated by the examples of the saints and it is a pity that it has no index whatsoever, not even an index of the chapters contained in each part.

The book deserves a wide circulation amongst the children of Mary and all lovers of the holy virtue.

THE SOUL OF MAN. An investigation of the facts of physiological and experimental psychology. By *Dr. Paul Carus.* With 152 illustrations and diagrams. Chicago, Ill.: The open Court Publishing Co. 1891.

What good is this work likely to effect? In our opinion very little. We have been disappointed in it. We were led to think it abler, more original, than on careful perusal we found it. We looked for things new and definite, things at least, more thoroughly scientific, more ad-

vanced, than had yet been given us in works of its kind, but we have met with keenest disappointment. Why, the old books advanced theories almost identical with the leading thoughts of this book. "Is the soul of man a mechanism?" The old, old problem and yet so far away from the truth. Verily we should give much to read something new on this question.

We should like very much to have the author give us a clear, candid, categorical definition of the soul, as he understands it. We have been taught, and sound reasoning sustains us in the view, to look upon the soul as the principle of life, and the essential form of man. From what we know of the intellect and its operations, its faculty of perception, of penetrating down into the essences of things, we have been led to believe it, not an organic and material faculty, but a spiritual power. So too have we been led by sound reasoning to judge of the human will.

In this book there are some interesting chapters, but they are only interesting; and that for their peculiarities, not for their sound philosophy or scientific value.

CONSIDERATIONES PRO REFORMATIONE VITÆ IN USUM SACERDOTUM, MAXIME TEMPORE EXERCITIORUM SPIRITUALIUM. Conscripsit *G. Roder, S. J.* Editio altera. Friburgi Brisgoviæ. Sumptibus Herder. 1891. Herder, St. Louis. Price, 55 cents.

Father Roder dedicates this little but most practical work to the clergy whose retreats he so often directed. Many of our clergy must be familiar with the "Examination of Conscience for the Use of Priests who are Making a Retreat," translated by Father Grimm, C. S. S. R., from the French of Gaduel. It is an admirable examination of conscience, going over the whole field of priestly life in the form of questions, which each one's conscience should answer. Father Roder's work, however, is scientific. It may be said to be a compendium of moral theology adapted to the sanctification of the priest. No better work could be taken to the retreat than this little manual. It ought to be found amongst the spiritual books of every priest's library. It is enriched by eight appendices. 1. A general table of sins. 2. Particular examination of conscience. 3. Scrupulosity. 4. Meditation. 5. Defects in the celebration of Mass. 6. Three days' retreat made privately. 7. Censures, excommunications. 8. Special prayers to be used by the clergy.

MORES CATHOLICI; OR, AGES OF FAITH. By *Kenelm H. Digby*. Vol. III., containing Books VII., VIII. and IX. New York: P. O'Shea. 1891.

In our notices of the first and second volumes of this admirable work, as they were successively published, we described at length its leading characteristics. Suffice it to say that it is a monument of the indefatigable industry, the profound learning and eminent ability of its author. In composing it he laid under contribution the treasures of knowledge accumulated by writers of every age, their sublimest thoughts and most devout meditations.

The volume before us treats of the fifth, sixth and seventh Beatitudes. They describe, in as many separate "Books," the blessedness of the Merciful, of the Clean of Heart, and of the Peace Makers. They show how profoundly these virtues interiorly penetrated the spirit of the Middle Ages and powerfully influenced society.

We congratulate Mr. O'Shea on having thus far progressed in his

laudable design of republishing all the works of Kenelm H. Digby in a uniform edition, and sincerely hope that he will receive such encouragement as will enable him to carry forward the enterprise to a successful termination.

LIFE OF ST. ALOYSIUS GONZAGA, OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS. Edited by *Rev. J F. X. O'Connor, S. J.* Written by the Students of Rhetoric, Class of '92, of St. Francis Xavier's College, New York City. Tercentenary Edition. St. Francis Xavier's College, New York. 1891.

The publication of this unpretentious but excellent book, just before the celebration of the Tercentenary of St. Aloysius, was certainly very opportune. It is a fitting tribute from a noble band of youths to the memory of a youthful Saint, and one whose characteristic virtues are precisely those which it is all important the young should practice. Love of wealth, of pleasure, of ease, are eating away the hearts of the young men and young women of our day. The allurements of fashion and ambition, of luxury, of superficial refinement are leading them away from habits of virtue into the devious paths of sin.

In strong contrast with all this, were the characteristic virtues of St. Aloysius—unselfishness, purity, humility, penance. And just these are virtues which, in this age, it is most important to practice, and the cultivation of which by the young will form their strongest safeguard against their becoming victims to the prevalent vices and sins of our times.

The charming style in which the work is written enhances the interest of the subject itself.

BLESSED J. B. DE LA SALLE, Founder of the Institute of the Brothers of the Christian Schools. By *Armand Ravelet.* Paris: Charles Poussielgue.

Blessed de la Salle is one of the great figures of his time, and not only of his own time, but of this, our time. For he still lives in his successors, the Brothers of the Christian Schools, and in the work which he planned and instituted, and which they are carrying on. It is impossible to mention popular education without bringing his name to mind. He was the first to found pedagogical teaching and the first to write for ignorant little children, to draw up and correct alphabets, catechisms, manuals of Christian politeness—the smallest and humblest class-books of the poor man's child.

The volume before us is not only a Life of the Blessed de la Salle, but also describes his methods of education, the foundation of his institute and the lives and labors of his chief successors.

To all who are concerned about the subject of Christian education, and especially the education of the poor, this book will be both interesting and valuable.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR KATHOLISCHE THEOLOGIE. III. and IV. Quartalheft, 1890. I., 1891. Innsbruck: Fel. Rauch. Vol. XIV.

The magazine is published by the Jesuit Fathers of the University of Innsbruck. It is made up of essays, reviews, book notices and literary notes. Part III. has articles on the nature of sin; the existence of sects in the Russian Church; and on Rome and the French Church in the 6th century. Part IV. has the continuation of the article on the nature of sin, and on papal infallibility in the canonization of saints; special

teachings of Luther; the relation of quantity to substance. Part I., 1891, has articles on Atheism and the Social Question; the restoration of the merit of good works lost by mortal sin; the appeal to the heart in the sermon and catechism; definition and nature of quantity; Professor Stralek on Altmann of Passau and Gregory VII. Each part is rich in book reviews and book notices. We need not add that the magazine is of the highest literary character, worthy of the Jesuit Faculty and of the University.

HISTORISCHES JAHRBUCH. Von *Dr. Hermann Grauert*, Professor of History in the University of Munich. XI., part III., and XII., part I.

We have called attention before to this admirable historical magazine. The first part of volume xii. informs us that hereafter the famous Dr. Ludwig Pastor, Professor of History in the University of Innsbruck, and Dr. Gustav Schnürer, Professor of History in the University of Freiburg, Switzerland, will act as associate editors, names which will certainly add greatly to the renown and usefulness of the magazine. The various historical dissertations to be found in each number are all by distinguished writers, whilst the reviews and notices of historical publications in every language and country in the world, make the magazine simply a necessity to the lover of history. We cannot see how any library that wishes to be considered "up to the times" can fail to subscribe to this valuable publication.

PERCY WYNN; OR, MAKING A BOY OF HIM. By *Francis J. Finn, S J.* (Neenah.) Benziger Bros. 12mo. Cloth. Gilt. $1.00.

Whoever has read Tom Brown at Rugby, the most popular book and classic for boys that has appeared in the last half century, will see at once that Tom Playfair and Percy are the Catholic models of Tom Brown and Arthur. It is a capital story of boy-life at a Jesuit boarding-school by one who has evidently been all through it himself. Without any sermonizing, moral lessons of the highest interest, drawn from the various incidents of school life are inculcated, almost without the reader being aware of it, so naturally do they flow from the course of the story. No boy can begin to read the book without finishing it, and no one can read it without being improved by it. It will certainly become a favorite premium book in our schools and deserves it. This is the second edition which has been greatly improved and enlarged by the addition of two new chapters.

THE HOLY FACE OF JESUS. A series of meditations on the Litany of the Holy Face. Adapted from the French of *Abbé J. B. Fourault*, Priest of the Holy Face. Benziger Bros. 1891. 32mo. 50 cents.

Rt. Rev. Monsignor Preston, D.D., introduces this little work to the American Catholic reader. It is wonderful how rapidly the devotion to the Holy Face of our divine Lord has spread during the last ten years. In many of the churches it has taken its place as one of the recognized devotions of the parish. We are sure that this series of short meditations will be welcomed by all who have been attracted by the devotion itself. It is an excellent manual not only for the month of April, the month dedicated to the Holy Face, but for any time.

LIFE AND SCENERY IN MISSOURI. Reminiscences of a Missionary Priest. Dublin: James Duffy & Co. 1890.

The title of this work is misleading. It is too modest and not sufficiently comprehensive. The sketches of which it consists give, it is true, many interesting and graphic descriptions of "life and scenery in Missouri;" but in addition to these, there is a large amount of valuable information respecting the history and growth of the Church in Missouri, and also a number of like descriptions and biographical sketches of priests and other ecclesiastics, and also of Catholic laymen whose labors largely contributed to the progress of Catholicity in Missouri.

SHORT SERMONS ON THE GOSPELS. For Every Sunday in the Year. By *Rev. N. M. Redmond.* 1890. Fr. Pustet & Co.: New York and Cincinnati.

That these sermons are really short, the fact that a 12mo. volume of 222 pages contains them sufficiently proves. But brevity is not their only merit; they are practical, lucid, and forcible, and particularly well adapted for the use of persons who are so situated as not to have opportunities for listening to regular courses of instruction. To priests on the mission they will also prove of service in the way of assisting them to prepare discourses on occasions when they have little or no time for previous study or reflection.

THE AVE MARIA. A Catholic Family Magazine, devoted to the Honor of the Blessed Virgin. Edited by a Priest of the Congregation of the Holy Cross. New Series. Volume Thirty-first. July—December, 1890. Notre Dame, Indiana.

To praise the *Ave Maria* is needless. Its merits are too widely known and too highly appreciated to require any commendation at our hands. The binding of the volume before us well befits its interesting, instructive and edifying contents.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

RUNDSCHREIBEN ERLASSEN VON U. H. VATER LEO XIII. UBER DIE ARBEITERFRAGE. Ssmi *D. N. Leonis* D. P. Papæ XIII. Litteræ Encyclicæ. De Conditione Opifi cum. St. Louis: Herder. Price, 22 cents. A German and Latin edition of the Pope's Encyclical. "*Rerum Novarum.*"

THE BLESSED SACRAMENT AND THE CHURCH OF ST. MARTIN AT LIÈGE. By *Dean Cruls.* Translated, by permission of Monsiegneur Doutreloux, Bishop of Liège, By William S. Preston. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates.

THE LIFE OF THE VENERABLE MADELINE BARAT, Foundress of the Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Drawn and Abridged from the French. By *Lady Georgiana Fullerton.* New York: P. O'Shea, Publisher. 1891.

SELECTED SERMONS. By *Rev. Christopher Hughes,* Pastor of St. Mary's Church, Fall River, Mass. Introduction by Rev. Walter Elliott, C. S. P. New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co. 1891.

TWO WAYS. By Anna Hanson Dorsey. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1891.

70749

PERIODICAL

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM